ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 8/10/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED001752	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). N.A.	3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Wrightstone, J. Wayne, Samuel D. McClelland, and others

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Assessment of the Demonstration Guidance Project

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Bureau of Education Research, Board of
ST. Education, New York
CITY, STATE New York
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Board of Education Division of Research and Evaluation, New York, New York

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	144

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☒

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☒
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

		homogeneous classes	program evaluation
	student motivation	parent attitudes	secondary school
culturally deprived	potential dropouts	peer acceptance	
guidance counseling	cultural enrichment	ability identification	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The purpose was to identify able students from disadvantaged urban areas and to stimulate them through cultural experiences, special classes, and guidance to seek higher educational and vocational goals. A primary objective was to refine the methods and techniques for prediction of academic potential, through aptitude testing, achievement testing, and counselor and teacher ratings in junior high school. In an overall sense, pupils who received academic diplomas and went on to college scored higher on each of these initial criteria than did students who did not complete high school.

In addition to the intensive counseling services for students involved in the project, there was remedial instruction in reading and arithmetic in the junior high school and special enriched instruction in small homogeneously grouped classes in high school, including a double period daily in English. The cultural enrichment program included visits to museums, libraries, colleges, plays, films, concerts, and places of historical interest.

Standardized tests in academic subjects show that project students made a greater gain in academic areas than had previous classes. Their greatest gain was in reading. Using a chronological age of 15 for the I.Q. score base there were appreciable gains in I.Q. among project students. There was positive peer acceptance among project and non-project students. Of the 329 project students, 21.3 dropped out of school and 51 entered some kind of post high school training, a major increase over comparable groups. Students emphasized the helpfulness of guidance services in the project, while teachers stressed the gains in student desires for higher education to be the project's greatest asset.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

3

ERIC Form 1

ED001752

ASSESSMENT OF THE DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE PROJECT

J. WAYNE WRIGHTSTONE, SAMUEL D. McCLELLAND
JUDITH I. KRUGMAN, HERBERT HOFFMAN
NORMAN TIEMAN, LINDA YOUNG

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ED00 1752

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

ASSESSMENT OF
THE DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE PROJECT

J. WAYNE WRIGHTSTONE, SAMUEL D. McCLELLAND
JUDITH I. KRUGMAN, HERBERT HOFFMAN
NORMAN TIEMAN, LINDA YOUNG

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Hundreds of persons in the schools, in the various bureaus and divisions of the Board of Education, and in the Community cooperated to conduct the Demonstration Guidance Project. Approximately one hundred twenty teachers participated in the program of educational stimulation in the two schools, over fifty in Junior High School 43 Manhattan and approximately seventy in George Washington High School. They gave of their skills, enthusiasm, and time unstintingly to help the students. They were called upon to keep special records and to prepare reports. They were observed time and again, often without notice, as visitors from all over the nation and from abroad came to see the Demonstration Guidance program in action. Appreciation is expressed to the other members of the faculties of both schools for their interest and support of the project and, in the junior high school, for their assistance in the tremendous tasks of identifying the able students and gathering information from students and parents, particularly in the first year of the program. Thanks should be given, also, to the Teachers' Committee of Junior High School 43 for their counsel and aid on the program and research activities in that school.

To those special project guidance and clinical personnel who served for three to six years and carried a major part of the program goes deep appreciation: Mr. David Shulman, project counselor in both Junior High School 43 Manhattan and George Washington High School, Mrs. Susan Blakey, project counselor at the junior high school, Mrs. Effie Marcus, counselor at the senior high school, Mrs. Helen Powers, social worker, and Mr. Morris Speevack, psychologist, for both schools. The credit for the development and organization of rich, imaginative cultural programs goes to the gifted project coordinators of cultural activities, Mrs. Frances Salzman in Junior High School 43 and Mrs. Marion Scully in George Washington High School.

Thanks are expressed to Mrs. Lena Crupain, project secretary, Mrs. Sadie Katz and Mrs. Rose Mundree, school secretaries at Junior High School 43, and to Mrs. Amelia Davis, Mrs. Marion Nash, Mrs. Ruth Oser and Mrs. Charlotte Stern of the secretarial staff at George Washington High School for typing and assembling the many reports and for performing the many other secretarial duties.

Staff members of the Bureau of Educational Research who worked on the identification, measurement and evaluation aspects during all or most of the years of the program included Mrs. Judith I. Krugman, psychologist, Dr. Norman Tieman and Dr. Herbert Hoffman, Research Associates. Special thanks are owed to Mrs. Myra Shulack, project secretary in the Bureau, who gave devoted service, assisting in collecting, recording, checking and tabulating data, in typing and collating innumerable reports, and in unobtrusively taking care of a myriad of detailed jobs.

Not only the schools and bureaus directly responsible for the project and its evaluation were involved. Nearly every high school in the city and many other schools and colleges cooperated in the follow-up studies conducted by the Bureau of Educational Research to learn what final levels of schooling were reached by the nearly twenty-seven hundred students who entered high schools from the Junior High School 43 Manhattan Classes of 1954 through 1959.

From the beginning, the project owed much to Mr. Richard Plaut, Chairman of the Subcommission on Guidance, Educational Stimulation and Placement of the Commission on Integration and President of the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro students and to Dr. S.A. Kendrick, Vice-President of the College Entrance Examination Board. They provided grants-in-aid from their organizations and assisted in college counseling and placement. The other Board of Education and community members of the Advisory Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. William Jansen and later of Dr. John J. Theobald, Superintendent of Schools, gave many hours of their time and contributed much to formulating policies for the Demonstration Guidance project and subsequently for the Higher Horizons program.

Whatever success the project had is also due in no small measure to the vision and leadership shown by both the Subcommission on Guidance, Educational Stimulation and Placement of the Commission on Integration and by the Board of Education in instituting this project. The persons who bore direct responsibility for the program were: Dr. Morris Krugman, Associate Superintendent for the Division of Child Welfare, who was an author of the initial plan and gave assistance and counsel throughout; Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, Acting Associate Superintendent for the Division of Research and Evaluation, who shared the responsibility, planned and supervised the research. The success of the project is also attributable to the school personnel who developed the program in the schools: Mr. Daniel Schreiber, Principal, and Miss Ethel J. Flanagan, Guidance Coordinator at Junior High School 43, Manhattan; and Mr. Henry T. Hillson, Principal, and Miss Florence C. Myers, Administrative Assistant at George Washington High School.

This report was prepared under the editorial supervision of Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, with the assistance of Dr. Samuel D. McClelland, Acting Director of the Bureau of Educational Research. Miss Linda Young of the Bureau staff contributed detailed editorial services in preparation of the final draft of the report. Mrs. Margaret Andreozzi contributed to the coordination of details in preparing and typing the final report.

Miss Ethel Flanagan wrote the first draft of the chapter describing the program in Junior High School 43, Manhattan. Mr. Henry T. Hillson and Miss Florence C. Myers contributed manuscript for the chapter on the program and findings at George Washington High School. The original manuscript was prepared by Mrs. Judith Krugman, Dr. Herbert Hoffman, and Dr. Norman Tieman of the bureau staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

PART I. OVERVIEW

Chapter

I. THE PURPOSES, GOALS, AND PLANS OF THE DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE PROGRAM 2

- Purpose and Prospectus of the Project 3
- Goals of the Project 7
- The Program for Project Students 10
- The Research and Evaluation Program 11

II. THE SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PROJECT OPERATED 14

- A. Junior High School 43, Manhattan 14
- B. George Washington High School 19

PART II. THE PROJECT IN OPERATION

III. IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS WITH ACADEMIC POTENTIAL 25

- A. Selection of Students for the Project 25
  - Selection of the Junior High School Project Students 26
  - Further Selection for the George Washington High School Classes 31
  - Summary of the Classification of Students through the Project Years 36
- B. Abilities of Junior High School Project Students as Revealed by Selection Criteria 38
- C. Abilities of Senior High School Project Students as Revealed by Selection Criteria 42

IV. THE PROJECT PROGRAM IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 43, MANHATTAN 46

- Guidance 46
- Clinical Services 49
- Special Instructional Program 51
- Remedial Services 52
- Cultural Enrichment Program 53
- Reaching and Influencing Parents 55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

V. THE PROJECT PROGRAM IN GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL 58

Guidance 58
Clinical Services 61
Special Instructional and Remedial Program 63
Cultural Enrichment Program 64
Reaching and Influencing Parents 65

PART III. FINDINGS

VI. MEASUREMENT OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE, AND ATTITUDES OF PROJECT STUDENTS 67

Growth in Reading for Junior High School Students 67
Comparability of Test Forms 71
Growth in Mathematics Achievement 72
Scholastic Averages of Project Students 75
Changes in Scholastic Aptitude 76
Social Acceptance in George Washington High School 78

VII. EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND PLANS 80

VIII. FINAL EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF PROJECT STUDENTS 87

High School Graduation and Post-High School Attendance 87
Comparison of Entire Junior High School 43 Population During Project Years with Total Population During Three Pre-Project Years 93

IX. PREDICTION OF ACADEMIC POTENTIAL 97

A. Tenth Grade Final Marks 97
B. Rank in Class at Graduation 98
C. Post-High School Educational Status I 99
D. Post-High School Educational Status II 101

X. STUDENT, PARENT, AND STAFF APPRAISAL OF THE PROJECT 105

A. Junior High School 43, Manhattan 105
B. George Washington High School 108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART IV. SUMMARY

Page

XI. THE PROJECT IN BRIEF 115

Overview 115
The Project in Operation 116
Findings 122
Concomitants and Consequences of the Project 126

APPENDIX A. Questionnaire: About Me and My Plans 128

APPENDIX B. Parent Questionnaire 130

APPENDIX C. High School Follow-Up Form 132

APPENDIX D. Post High School Data Form 134

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Percentages for Junior High School Project Students on Several Background Factors.......... 17
2. Criteria for Admission to Project Classes in Junior High School 43, Manhattan.......... 29
3. Admissions to Senior High Schools from Junior High School 43, Manhattan.......... 32
4. Criteria for Admission to Project Classes in George Washington High School.......... 33
5. Admissions to George Washington High School Project Classes.......... 34
6. Junior High School Experimental Students Who Entered Special Academic High Schools.......... 35
7. Medians on Tests Used in Selection of 717 Project Students in Junior High School 43, Manhattan.......... 39
8. Differences Between Median Grade Equivalent Scores of Experimental Classes and the Adjusted Grade Norms.......... 41
9. Medians on Selected Tests and Ratings of 365 Entrants to High School Project.......... 42
10. High School Project Entrants' IQs on Pintner Intermediate Verbal Test, and SRA Nonverbal Test Administered at Junior High School 43, Manhattan.......... 43
11. High School Project Entrants' Achievement in Ninth Grade on Stanford Paragraph Meaning, and Arithmetic.......... 44
12. Comparison of Median Grade Equivalent Scores on the Paragraph Meaning Section of the Stanford Reading Test, Form JM by 147 Students in the Third Project Group.......... 69
13. Comparison of Median Grade Equivalent Scores Made by 68 Boys and 79 Girls In the Third Project Group on the Paragraph Meaning Section Of the Stanford Test, Form JM.......... 70
14. Comparison of Median Grade Equivalent Scores of Third Project Group On the Stanford Arithmetic Test, Form JM.......... 72

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

15. Achievement on Seattle Algebra Test, First Half by 401 Ninth Grade Students in the First and Second Project Groups.. 73

16. End of Term Marks, June 1958, In Geometry for 79 Project Students Registered in Course at George Washington High School.. 74

17. Average in Major Subjects of 329 George Washington High School Project Entrants.................................. 75

18. Expressed Educational Aspirations of Project Students as Elicited by the Questionnaire "About Me and My Plans".. 81

19. Comparison of Boys and Girls on Types of Post-High School Education Desired.................................... 83

20. Comparison of Project and National High Ability Students on Educational Aspirations and Plans............. 84

21. Comparison of Project and National High Ability Students on Career Aspirations............................ 85

22. Final High School Outcomes for 329 George Washington High School Project Entrants from Junior High School 43, Manhattan who Remained in George Washington High School... 88

23. Type of Post-High School Education for George Washington High School Project Students.............................. 89

24. Final High School Status of Junior High School Experimental Students Who Did Not Enter the High School Project......... 91

25. Type of Post-High School Education for Junior High School Experimental Students Who Did Not Enter the High School Project.. 92

26. Educational Status of Entire Junior High School 43 Graduating Classes During Project and Pre-Project Years... 94

27. Type of Post-High School Education for Junior High School 43 Graduating Classes During Project and Pre-Project Years... 95

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

28. Correlations between Tenth Grade Marks in Major Subjects and Predictive Criteria for Students in the First and Second High School Project Groups.......................... 98

29. Correlations between Class Standing at Graduation from George Washington High School and Six Junior High School Predictors for 85 Students in the First Project Group.. 99

30. Correlations between Post-High School Educational Status and Eight Junior High School Predictors for all Three Groups of Experimental Students from George Washington High School.. 100

31. Mean Scores on Each Criterion for Project Students in Categories 1 and 5.. 102

PART I

OVERVIEW

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSES, GOALS, AND PLANS OF THE DEMONSTRATION GUIDANCE PROJECT

The Commission on Integration was established by resolution of the Board of Education of the City of New York on December 23, 1954.[1] As a phase of its promotion of the ideal of racially integrated schools, it dedicated its efforts toward educational improvement. It said:

> The Commission must also address itself to the closely related and crucial problem of raising the educational and vocational aspirations of talented students from economically and socially deprived areas.

The Commission worked through six subcommissions which submitted their findings and recommendations during 1956 and 1957. While each subcommission dealt with different problems, "two themes form the warp and woof of all the reports: we must integrate as much and as quickly as we can; we must raise the educational and aspirational levels of our underprivileged children."[2]

Recommendation No. 7 of the Subcommission on Guidance, Educational Stimulation and Placement, under the chairmanship of Mr. Richard L. Plaut, led to the initiation of the Demonstration Guidance Project. The Subcommission asked Dr. Morris Krugman, its guidance consultant, who had submitted the initial proposal, to prepare and present the specific plans for such a Demonstration Guidance Project, and Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, its research consultant, to outline the research and evaluation procedures. In May 1956 the Advisory Committee for the project met with the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. William Jansen, to discuss these basic plans and their implementation. In September 1956 the project was started in a junior high school.

---

[1] Journal of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1954 Vol. 2, p. 4126.

[2] Toward Greater Opportunity: A Progress Report from the Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education Dealing with Implementation of Recommendations of the Commission on Integration. (Board of Education of the City of New York, June 1960), p. 5.

A Previous Pilot Study

Some of the aspects of the Demonstration Guidance Project evolved from previous experiences.

From 1950 to 1954, a pilot project in curriculum and cultural enrichment was conducted in P.S. 125, Manhattan, under the direction of the Bureau of Educational Research. The purpose of the project was to discover the effects of a school program designed to help compensate for the disadvantages of children living in a low socio-economic area. The pupils involved in the pilot project consisted of one class of children who participated in a longitudinal study from third to sixth grade. The project was stimulated by the interest of Assistant Superintendent Clare C. Baldwin in charge of the local school district. The study was carried out with his continued support and encouragement and with the generous cooperation of the school administrators and teachers of both the experimental and comparison schools.

The findings of the study pointed up the serious impact of these disadvantages on child development in low socio-economic areas and stressed the urgency for action and research by community and schools. The implications about class size, school staff, an enriched educational program, measurement of children's abilities, motivation for school learning, and community mental health services confirmed the beliefs of educators that an enrichment and guidance program can produce favorable results.

Purpose and Prospectus of the Project

The project, which was carried on in Junior High School 43, Manhattan, and George Washington High School, was designed to demonstrate what could be done to identify and stimulate able students from socially and economically deprived urban areas to reach higher educational and vocational levels. These schools received increased financial support, were allotted more auxiliary services, and had a special program. The special program for the selected students was to include expanded, dynamic guidance and counseling services, special instructional and remedial help, broader cultural opportunities and experiences, new approaches to parent education, financial or job aid, and clinical services for students who required any of these. It was expected that the combined approaches, beginning in junior high school and continuing through senior high school, would help to compensate for limitations stemming from cultural disadvantage or difference, would motivate the students to utilize more fully their scholastic potential, and enable them to raise their aspirations and achievement.

The early prospectus of the project stated:

> It is well known that tests of mental ability usually do not measure the full intellectual potential of children who come from low status socio-economic homes, or homes in which there is cultural deprivation. Neither do such children demonstrate the academic achievement that other, more privileged children of comparable ability do, with the result that relatively few of the under-privileged children pursue post-high school education, if indeed they complete even modified high school courses ....
>
> In the concern for this type of child, it is proposed to institute a program for the early identification and stimulation of able students who are not now identified, and to combine this program with one of teacher education in the identification and stimulation of able students of the type mentioned.
>
> The proposed study has, as one of its very important objectives, the search for potential college students among junior high school students who normally do not think of themselves as continuing their education after high school.[3]

While the best place for schools to begin such a program would be in elementary school,[4] it was thought that much could still be done if students were reached at least several years before school leaving age.

The Problem of Educationally Underdeveloped Groups: A National Problem

Although the project was inaugurated to meet a local need, the problem it was attacking was by no means local. There had been growing national concern about both the individual human loss and the national waste involved in this large and relatively untapped potential of ability. The problem of equalizing opportunities for the educationally underdeveloped was a nationwide challenge in 1955, and remains so today.

---

[3] Reprinted in "Demonstration Guidance Project Designed to Identify, Stimulate and Upgrade Potential College Students." Board of Education Guidance News, Vol. IX, No. 2, January 1957, pp. 4-5.

[4] The Higher Horizons Program, an extension of the project, was later introduced in elementary as well as junior high schools to help all children, not merely those with academic potential.

Many factors determine whether a student will go to college. Mental ability and school record are, of course, basic. Among the other important determinants are sex, vocational goals, geographic region, proximity of college, size of family, parents' educational, financial, and occupational level, and the student's motivation for higher learning. The conclusions reached in numerous studies indicate that socio-economic level plays a very decisive role.[5]

Havinghurst and Rodgers reported in the 1950's that 80 per cent of the children in the three upper social classes, 25 per cent of those in the lower-middle class, and only 5 per cent of the lower-class children attend college. These figures are particularly startling because the majority of the population is included in the last category. The three upper classes have about 10 per cent of all the children, the lower-middle class has about 30 per cent, and about 60 per cent come from the lower class.[6] Wolfle estimated that among high school graduates, two-thirds of those whose fathers are in professional and semi-professional occupations, one-half of those whose fathers are in managerial and white collar occupations, and one-fourth of those whose fathers are farmers or manual workers enter college.[7] A 1957 New York State study of nearly 50,000 high school seniors found that, "the relationship between family occupational status, scholastic ability, and college plans of seniors is quite consistent. Occupational status appears to be more closely related to the decision to attend college than scholastic ability, although both factors are important."[8]

---

[5] Cole, Charles C. Jr. Encouraging Scientific Talent. A study of America's able students who are lost to college and of ways of attracting them to college and science careers. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1956. There is an excellent summary of studies of the many factors on pages 57-105.

[6] Hollingshead, Byron S. Who Should Go to College? with a Chapter by Havighurst, Robert J. and Rodgers, Robert R. on "The Role of Motivation in Attendance at Post-High School Educational Institutions." A Staff Study for The Commission on Financing Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952, pp. 139-140.

[7] Wolfle, Dael. America's Resources of Specialized Talent. A Current Appraisal and a Look Ahead. The Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954, p. 160.

[8] University of the State of New York, Needs and Facilities in Higher Education in New York State. Albany: The State Education Department, 1957, p. 23.

In New York City and in other large urban areas the lower socioeconomic groups include large numbers of newcomers and minority groups who have had limited education and few opportunities to work their way up from the lower rungs of the occupational and social ladder. Common to these groups generally are low educational motivation and a feeling of alienation, a feeling that they are second-class citizens in the dominant culture, and that the opportunities and rewards of society have little to do with them. The social and economic discrimination and barriers that many of these people have met have aggravated still further this sense of being excluded from the main stream. The children of these families constitute a large percentage of the school population.

Despite provisions that were meant to offer equal educational opportunities to all, the large majority of boys and girls from these groups have not been able to take full advantage of opportunities for higher education. Children of professional and other college-educated families are oriented all their lives toward college, and it is the rare child who does not expect to go to college. Among most families of lower occupational and minority groups without an educational tradition there is usually slight expectation of college attendance and it is the unusual child who thinks of himself as a college candidate. Although there have been some who were able to break out of these confines, the large majority have been stifled by limited expectations, and any program to upgrade these groups must take into consideration that lack of motivation is a primary block and is a result of social attitudes, as well as of school programs that sometimes have little meaning or challenge for these students.

What Happens if Compensating School Programs are not Provided?

The out-of-school learning environment and experiences which facilitate and reinforce school learning tend to be restricted for most of these children from birth, so that the child comes to school with deficiencies which serve to handicap him from the very beginning, and continue to do so. Before they begin school, few of these children have had the wealth of opportunity, experience and resources that most middle class children have had and which have provided them with a foundation of information, concepts, vocabulary, skills, values, and attitudes favorable to school success. At home few have children's books, records, arts and crafts materials, and creative toys, have had stories read to them regularly, or have been taken on the usual children's excursions. Many of the parents are beset by economic and other problems, have had limited education, have little time or energy to spend with their children, and often are ignorant of what are appropriate, worthwhile experiences for young children. Sometimes they cannot give them even the basic attention and emotional satisfaction that children need. Hence, many of these children, particularly in the school setting, feel less secure and confident than most middle class children, even though in some ways they have been forced to be more independent and to assume responsibilities beyond their years.

When they enter school their feelings of alienation in the school world are reinforced by a curriculum that may seem unreal, irrelevant, useless, or in conflict with their world outside. Too many of the published "readers" for beginning readers are about a middle-class, surburban or small-town white family, complete with house, car, pets, affluent grandparents with a house in the country, and all the other appurtenances of the "perfect" family. Some of the other content of the curriculum also is strange to these children. Since most teachers come from a middle class environment and, to a large extent, take middle class values for granted, they may also unwittingly augment the children's bewilderment. True, some teachers have tried to counteract this, have been sensitive to the children's feelings and needs, have tried to build up their sense of self-worth, have provided meaningful experiences, have hunted for and created materials, and have used a wide variety of more appropriate initial reading matter. But these efforts and materials have been too limited.

In short order, limited motivation and experience lead to low achievement which in turn leads to low expectation by teachers and a vicious circle is in full swing. Teachers, seeing poor achievement in class, tend to have low goals for the children who readily fall into the pattern of low expectations. Then, as the children go into the upper grades and take further group intelligence tests which depend increasingly upon reading, the test results are even lower than before and are cited as the reason for poor achievement. Failure is now inescapable for many of these children. By the time they get to the junior high school many of them have a deep sense of defeat, a feeling of low self-esteem in the school situation, and a wish to escape school. Many do leave as soon as they can do so legally, and some even before that.

The casualties are greater among the boys than the girls, possibly because boys are more influenced by the street culture, and consider school a feminine institution since there are so few male teachers in their early school years and few activities appealing to these boys.

That some have not succumbed, but have somehow had the desire for education kindled and kept burning, have had the incentive, will and fortitude to overcome deficiencies and to obtain higher education is a tribute to the particular children and families, and indicates that such handicaps can be overcome. But this is not the answer for the majority unable to lift itself by its bootstraps. If special help is not given, this group is likely to remain educationally unmotivated and undeveloped.

Goals of the Project

To try to identify children with academic and other talents, to free these children's energies for learning, to spark their ambitions, to build up their self-respect, to decrease the sense of alienation and inculcate a sense of belonging, to instil a desire for education strong enough for them to be willing to work hard for it, to fill in the gaps in learning and experience — to do all this is certainly no easy task. But that is what the project undertook to do. That it had to take some risks, such as expecting too much from some children was necessary in the present state of knowledge. On the other hand, the project began at a time ripe for such efforts. The social ferment following World War II, the Supreme Court decision on integration in 1954, the increased prosperity for all segments of the population, the shift in the work force with need for larger numbers of skilled workers, and the new national and world-wide emphasis on education provided a social climate conducive to encouraging higher aspirations among all underdeveloped groups.

Initially, a prime objective of the Demonstration Guidance Project was to help and encourage students to enter college. Consequently, the project set out to identify and concentrate on those students who might possibly show promise of academic potential, and to motivate them and help improve their achievement so that more of them would go to college than had gone from previous classes. In the past, very few students in Junior High School 43, whose student body came mainly from families of low or very modest income without a tradition of higher education, had continued education beyond high school.

It was soon found that this initial goal of college preparation was too limited. At first, all students selected to go on to the high school project groups had been enrolled in the academic course in high school. However, when it was found that a large number of these students were unable to sustain themselves in the college preparatory course despite all the special services, the objectives of the program were broadened to provide for these students. The project could help them to succeed in other courses, to remain in the school longer, to broaden their cultural horizons, to lead more successful lives. Although students who were failing in the academic course were released from the project, it was decided to continue to work with them in the other courses.

The Selection of Schools for the Demonstration Guidance Project

As has been stated earlier, the schools selected for the Demonstration Guidance Project were Junior High School 43, Manhattan and George Washington High School. Among the criteria used in selection were, the existence of a coeducational student body including Negro, Puerto Rican and other students, an outstanding dedicated principal and guidance chairman. Further requirements for the junior high school were that it be in a low socio-economic area, drawing most of its student body from the area and that it be accessible to an academic high school which qualified to be the project high school.

In accordance with the original plans, the project was in operation for a total of six years. It was in Junior High School 43, Manhattan for three years, beginning in 1956 with the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. It remained in George Washington High School for five years, from 1957-1962, so that all three classes from the junior high school had an opportunity to complete high school under this program. Thus, the first class (the ninth grade when the project began) was in the program for four years, the second class for five years, and the third class for six years.

The Proposed Project Program

The early plans provided guides for the program of identification and educational stimulation of able students. They included the training of teachers in the identification, stimulation, and instruction of such children so that their potentialities would be better realized. Plans for the research and evaluation of the program were formulated. These basic proposals are set forth in the remainder of this chapter. The specific methods, procedures, and techniques that were used by the schools and the Bureau of Educational Research are described in subsequent chapters.

Identification of Students for the Project

The plan stipulated that the able students be identified in the junior high school, and the success of this selection be tested by the final success of the students in high school and beyond. Since the conventional methods of identifying ability fail to locate able students whose talents are hidden by early deprivation, and since there are currently no adequate methods of measuring such hidden potential, the project planned to take the following approaches:

a. Use a variety of techniques for clues about student potential, and experiment with new approaches.

b. Include in the project pupils who showed even faint promise of academic potential for post-high school education.

c. Keep the project groups in junior high school flexible so that students could be moved in or out of these groups as further evidence was gathered about their abilities.

d. Review the evidence about the students before they graduated from junior high school to select those to remain in the project in senior high school.

The Program for the Project Students

The program to be provided for the project students included certain minimum essentials at both the junior and senior high schools although the specific implementation and emphasis differed in each school. It recognized that it was necessary to have a combination of several approaches in both schools, as well as coordination with the community. Briefly, the project was to do the following:

a. Provide a full guidance program with intensive individual counseling and dynamic group guidance. In addition to expanding the regular program this was to involve developing new guidance materials, utilizing the school library and audio-visual aids, providing vital occupational information, arranging informational and inspirational assemblies, organizing trips to colleges, institutions, and industry to see people in action in the higher schools, in professions and other occupations, coordinating related guidance activities involved in health, attendance and other school services, and coordination with other community agencies.

b. Adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of students. Provide instruction and learning conditions conducive to raising their achievement levels and to developing independent study habits and a respect for learning and the effort it entails.

c. Provide remedial help and clinical service, including psychological examination, social work, and psychiatric consultation for those who require assistance beyond what can be given in the regular instructional and counseling program.

d. Broaden the students' cultural contacts, extend their experiences and expand their horizons, offering opportunities to attend cultural events, helping them to understand and appreciate good theatre, music, dance, fine art, etc., and to learn about the city's resources.

e. Conduct parent education as a fundamental part of the project, developing new approaches, making parents aware of what educational and vocational opportunities are open to their children if they can meet the requirements, what the various requirements are, and helping parents to appraise their children's abilities and achievement to have them take advantage of educational opportunities.

f. Assist in finding part-time employment or give direct aid to the students who need this to remain in high school, and especially provide or arrange for substantial financial assistance or scholarships for the large number who require this to continue schooling beyond high school.

g. Prepare as many students as possible for college and help them gain college admission. Follow up these students after high school to give them the support they may need in adjusting to post-high school education, to continue any necessary financial aid, and to evaluate the success of the project.

h. Conduct a continuous evaluation and research program.

Other essentials were also included in the original plans. No matter how good the identification, for the student and parent programs, the project could have little chance for success without these other requirements:

a. Administrators who were not only sympathetic to the goals of the project but who could supply imaginative leadership in developing the approaches to implement these goals.

b. Additional funds.

c. Additional personnel - guidance, instructional, clinical, and research.

d. Full faculty participation.

e. Appropriate teacher training.

f. Community support

The Research and Evaluation Program

The research and evaluation purposes of the Demonstration Guidance Project were:

a. To identify all potentially academically able youth through the use of every possible device, including group tests, teacher and counselor observations and ratings, recognizing that the usual tests of academic aptitude and achievement may underestimate the potential ability of children from disadvantaged neighborhoods.

b. To make studies of the so-called culture-fair tests as predictors of academic and educational achievement.

c. To determine the changes in the verbal IQ of disadvantaged youth who have received cultural and educational stimulation and enrichment from the school.

d. To assess the academic achievement of disadvantaged youth under a program of remedial activities and cultural enrichment with special attention to scholastic averages in academic courses.

e. To make follow-up studies of the final high school outcomes and post-high school education of comparison groups of youth who did not receive such stimulation and guidance.

f. To assess the aspirations of youth and their parents as influenced by this program.

g. To appraise the social adaptability of students in this project.

h. To make studies of the students', parents' and teachers' opinions and evaluations of the project.

Administration of the Project

The main financial support for the project was provided by the Board of Education, with some additional funds from the College Entrance Examination Board for six years and from the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students for the first three years. Representatives of these organizations and other civic leaders served with Board of Education personnel on an Advisory Committee headed by the Superintendent of Schools to determine general policy and directions for the project.

Responsibility for conducting the study was shared by the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance and the Bureau of Educational Research. The guidance bureau was responsible for the guidance program and worked jointly with the research bureau on identification procedures and research plans. The research bureau carried the major responsibility for the identification and measurement procedures as well as evaluation.

The direction and implementation of the program in the schools were the responsibility of the respective principals and guidance coordinators. At Junior High School 43, Manhattan, these were Mr. Daniel Schreiber, Principal, and Miss Ethel J. Flanagan, Guidance Counselor. At George Washington High School, they were Mr. Henry T. Hillson, Principal, and Miss Florence C. Myers, Administrative Assistant.

CHAPTER II

THE SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PROJECT OPERATED

A. JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 43, MANHATTAN

Introduction and Duration of the Project

Junior High School 43, Manhattan, was selected for the Demonstration Guidance Project since it met adequately the criteria set up by the Advisory Commission on Integration. These criteria, as stated in Chapter I, were that the school selected have a coeducational student population of low socio-economic status and a mixed ethnic character. The school was to have a dedicated principal and guidance counselor. In addition, it was necessary that the school be accessible to an academic high school in which the project could be continued.

In December 1956, experimental classes for grades 7, 8, and 9 were set up in Junior High School 43. The experimental classes were continued in the school until June 1959, when the youngest group was ready for graduation from junior high school. As each project class completed grade 9 some of the students were selected to continue in the experimental classes in George Washington High School. (These senior high school project students were selected on the basis of criteria to be discussed later.) In this report, therefore, it is always specified whether the terms "project group" and "project students" refer to the junior high school project students or the senior high school project students. In addition, each group is designated as the first, second, or third project group. The first project group was in ninth grade at the project's inception and had only one junior high school project year prior to the three senior high school years. Thus, the first project group students who were selected to continue in the senior high school experimental classes had a total of four years in the project. This group was ready for senior high school graduation in 1960. The second project group was in grade 8 at the project's inception and thus had two junior high school project years prior to senior high school. The students from this group who remained in the project were ready for graduation from senior high school in 1961. The third project group started in the project in grade 7 and had three years in the project before graduating from junior high school. Those students in the third project group who went on to the senior high school experimental classes were prepared for graduation in 1962. This third group had thus completed a total of six years in the project.

The Junior High School Community

The school district extends from Riverside Drive to St. Nicholas Terrace and from 116 Street to 145 Street, an area containing Manhattan's Morningside Heights and a small portion of West Harlem. The housing ranges from overcrowded substandard tenements to modern project apartment dwellings. The large majority of the population is in the low-income group, but there are also some middle-income families. An intensive slum clearance program took place in the neighborhhod during 1955 and 1956. The area surrounded by 123 Street, 125 Street, Morningside Avenue, and Broadway had already been cleared and replaced by the General Grant Development for low-income families and by Morningside Gardens, a middle-income cooperative. Families moved into the General Grant Development throughout the first year of the project (1956-1957) but Morningside Gardens was not ready for occupancy until the late summer and fall of 1957.

The Student Population at Junior High School 43

Junior High School 43, Manhattan, has a student population of approximately 1400. During the time of the project, the mobility of the student body was high. However, the 400 new students who were admitted during the school year were balanced by the 400 who moved away or dropped out.

In 1956, at the time of the project's inception, approximately 48 per cent of the students were Negro, 40 per cent Puerto Rican, and 12 per cent White or Others. Many of the school's children came from broken homes in which there was no father and the mother worked. Others came from motherless homes and lived with the father, grandmother, or other relative. For those children who were new arrivals from Puerto Rico or the southern states there were special problems. The Spanish-speaking students needed to learn English and all had to orient themselves to a new high-pressure, urban society and to different cultural values.

The Regular Program at Junior High School 43

In September 1956, the staff of Junior High School 43 comprised one principal, four assistants-to-principal, and 71 teachers. There were also two remedial reading teachers, an attendance and behavior counselor, and a Puerto Rican coordinator. A speech improvement teacher and a Youth Board social worker were assigned to the school one day a week.

There were 36 regular classes and one Special Progress class in which bright pupils could complete the three year junior high school curriculum in two years. In addition there were five special language classes for non-English-speaking students, six adjustment classes for children with emotional or behavioral difficulties, and one class for children with retarded mental development.

A community center program was conducted in the school from 3:00 to 5:00 each school day. Also, an evening community center program run by the New York City Youth Board was available to students, teenagers, and young adults from 7:00 to 10:00 P.M.

Additional Staff Allotments and Costs for the Project

In order to carry out the program of early identification and stimulation of able students, additional personnel were needed. Three full-time counselors were added to the staff, one to each of the three project groups. Each counselor moved along with his group. The regular school counselor who had previously served the school on a three day a week basis was assigned full-time as coordinator of the project. The budget also provided for the part-time services of a psychiatrist, a psychologist and a social worker. Two additional teachers were assigned to remedial arithmetic, one part-time to foreign language remedial service, and one teacher, also part-time, to educational and cultural enrichment. To these were added clerical assistants and research consultants.

The special services mentioned previously remained constant throughout the three-year period of the project. These were the two original remedial reading teachers, attendance and behavior counselor, Puerto Rican coordinator, speech improvement teacher and Youth Board social worker. Both the afternoon and the evening community centers were also continued. The budget for 1957-1958 included the salaries of two teachers for the summer remedial reading program. The average per capita cost was approximately $80 per year above the regular allotment for each pupil in the experimental classes.

Description of the Junior High School Project Students

While it was not possible to obtain precise data, some appropriate estimates and valuable insights into the economic, occupational, educational, and other family background factors of the students were obtained from pupil responses on the questionnaire, "About Me and My Plans",[1] information on school records, and counselor observations.[1]

---

[1] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 20. (Mimeographed) Also, see, Appendix A.

Table 1 presents percentages for the initial group of experimental students on selected background factors.

TABLE 1

Percentages for Junior High School Project Students on Several Background Factors

	Per Cent
Fathers in professions	4.8
Fathers managers or proprietors	5.9
Receive free lunch	21.7
Receive home relief	5.9
Live with both parents	55.3
Live with mother only	24.2
Live with relatives or other guardians	6.7
Born in New York City	49.6
Born in Puerto Rico	19.0
Born in the South	16.3

Occupational status is an important indicator of socio-economic level. However, data on the fathers' or guardians' occupation were missing for nearly 23 per cent of the experimental and 41 per cent of the non-experimental population. (This was primarily where the fathers were not living at home or were reported to be deceased.) Nonetheless, there was a clear concentration in the lower occupational categories and a very limited representation in the professional and managerial classifications. Generally, the group did not have deep roots in the city. Only half of the students and less than 10 per cent of the parents were born in New York City. Their varied backgrounds made it difficult for many of these children to understand and adjust to school goals and to New York City culture.

The experimental population included approximately 53 per cent Negro, 29 per cent Puerto Rican, 3 per cent Hispanic, nearly 13 per cent White, and less than 3 per cent Oriental. Although the Puerto Rican students did not constitute as large a proportion of the experimental group as of the total population in the school (38.4 per cent) they nonetheless made up a sizeable portion of the experimental students (29.3 per cent).

Within the experimental group the Puerto Rican students seemed, on the basis of both quantitive and qualitative analyses of the data, to be the most depressed ethnic group occupationally and economically, and as a group, they had the lowest educational aspirations. Approximately 25 per cent wished to terminate their education with the high school graduation compared with approximately 31 per cent of the White group, 8 per cent of the Negro group, 5 per cent of the other Hispanic group, and none of the Oriental students. The Negro students had higher educational aspirations and were more interested in attending college than any other group except for the tiny Oriental group. Since the questionnaire "About Me and My Plans" was filled out by all the students at the junior high school, it was possible to see the ways in which the experimental students differed from the student body as a whole. Although many of the children in the experimental group were faced with limitations and deprivations in socio-economic and cultural factors and in home life, the experimental students tended to be somewhat more favored than the non-experimental students. For example, 21.7 per cent of the experimental students and 50.5 per cent of the non-experimental students were receiving free lunches. (The total city rate is 7 per cent.) Of the 43 fathers in professions, 34 (4.8 per cent) were in the experimental group as compared with 9 (1.5 per cent) in the non-experimental group. In the combined four upper-level categories (professionals, managers, and proprietors, clerical workers, and sales workers) there were 23 per cent of all of the experimental fathers and 6.4 per cent of the non-experimental fathers. These findings, though, cannot show the full extent of the differences due to the much larger proportion of the occupationally unclassified in the non-experimental group.

Some of the experimental students came from comfortable homes where they had cultural advantages, and even among the students from homes with severe financial problems there were some who were supported by warm family relationships and by family cultural and educational traditions and interests. However, nearly half of the students came from broken homes. Many also had to contend with social pathology in their homes or those of their relatives or neighbors. The large majority of the students came from the lower economic strata and had few cultural advantages or opportunities.

B. GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

Introduction and Duration of the Project

The Demonstration Guidance Project at George Washington High School ran for five years, from the entrance of the first experimental group in 1957 until graduation of the last group in 1962. Three project groups were graduated from the high school during this period in the years 1960, 1961, and 1962. The experimental classes were first organized in Junior High School 43 in grades 7, 8, and 9. Thus, the project students who came to George Washington High School had been in the junior high school project for varying periods of time. All the children who were continued from the junior high school project spent the same length of time, three years, in the George Washington High School project.

It was decided that not all the junior high school project graduates would continue in the senior high school experimental classes. Prior to the entrance of each class into the senior high school, personnel from both schools met to discuss the choice of students for the senior high school program. The selection was made from those who were considered by the junior high school to have some academic potential on the basis of criteria to be discussed in Chapter 3.

The Senior High School Community

George Washington High School stands on a cliff overlooking the Harlem and Hudson Rivers on the highest point in Manhattan and is a dominant feature of Washington Heights in Manhattan's upper west side. A marker on the school grounds points to where American troops fell fighting the British during the Revolutionary War. It is a beautiful school and is regarded with pride by the students who attend it.

The student body in the 1920's was predominantly middle class with some 80 per cent of its graduates going on to college. Part of the school remains middle class, but George Washington High School at present draws 10 per cent of its 5,000 students from fifty different foreign countries; another 25 per cent of its students are Negro; 10 per cent are Puerto Rican. Half of its graduates go on to some form of higher education. In the month following the beginning of each school year, 500 new pupils arrive; another 500 on register move away or drop out. The school program is as varied as its population; on the same corridor there may well be classes with a median IQ. of 140 doing Advanced Placement work, classes in "modified English" where the median IQ. will be in the 80's, and classes for the foreign language-speaking where none of the usual measurements can be taken. High academic standards are maintained for those capable of meeting them.

In brief, George Washington High School sums up what is meant by a changing school in a changing community. It reflects a neighborhood that holds to a tradition of the past but is accommodating itself to a very different present.

Additional Staff Allotments and Costs for the Project

Since the purpose of the project was to upgrade boys and girls coming from a background of limited cultural experience, George Washington High School planned a major program of cultural enrichment, with special classes and counseling assistance provided for everyone in the project. This included even those students who had a good record in the junior high school.

Such a plan required a much greater expenditure per pupil than had been available in the junior high school. There was one additional classroom teacher for every 30 pupils, compared to one such extra position per 160 pupils in the junior high school. In the counseling program the ratio was also more favorable. Although the senior high school project classes were approximately half the size they had been in the junior high school, each of the three project classes nonetheless kept its own guidance counselor who moved along with it through both junior and senior high schools. A psychologist and a social worker were assigned to the senior high school project for one day a week each for the first year, and two days a week for the second and third years.

For all extra services, the cost at George Washington High School was approximately $250 per pupil per year beyond the usual allocation. (The additional yearly per capita cost for the junior high school project was $80.)

The Senior High School Project Students

A total of 365 pupils entered the special program at George Washington High School: 54 per cent were Negro; 26 per cent Puerto Rican; 18 per cent White; and 2 per cent Oriental. Although these were the better junior high school project students, the majority were far from ready for college preparatory work. Even for many of those whose records indicated above average ability, personal and home situations made for great difficulties.

Since all project students were aspiring to a college education, at least in theory, all were initially placed in the academic course, and every effort was made to meet their needs within this framework. Because the program was experimental, many students were included even though it seemed evident from the outset that they would not succeed in the academic course of study. When there was no longer any question about this, these students were shifted to courses in which they could maintain themselves.

Inevitable and continued failure might well have led to truancy, disciplinary problems, and eventual dropout. Although no longer in the academic track, they continued to receive special counseling for the remainder of their senior high school years. After the change many of these pupils not only stayed on to graduate but went on to higher education in keeping with their abilities.

C. THE PREPROJECT GROUPS IN THE COMPARISON STUDY

The Demonstration Guidance project included plans for a comparison with previous classes to measure the success of the program with respect to its goals of stimulation of students to take and complete an academic course, to graduate from high school, and to go to college or continue other schooling. The three classes selected for purposes of comparison were those which graduated from Junior High School 43, Manhattan, in 1954, 1955 and 1956, the three years immediately preceding the inception of the project. In addition, a preliminary, less complete study was made of the junior high school class of 1953.

Certain factors, such as neighborhood, type of population, school staff, and school plant were more nearly constant for the project and preproject years in the same school than they could be for project and concurrent students in a different school no matter how careful the attempt to equate the schools. However, such a comparison with an earlier period cannot be taken at face value. It has to take into account any factors, other than the experimental variables, which may be operating differently in different years.

During the project years the social climate became increasingly favorable to encouraging students to continue their education and there was a burgeoning drive to uplift minority and deprived groups. In addition, there were new openings in the growing community colleges. However, these facilitating factors were offset to some degree by increasingly rigorous requirements for high school graduation and college admission. For example, there were both school and citywide changes during this period which raised the requirements for an academic diploma. In preproject years, students in this school could earn an academic diploma if they had taken modified classes in English and social studies provided they passed the Regents examinations. Beginning with the 1957 entrants, modified courses could no longer be credited for this diploma. The hurdle became even higher for the third project class which was affected by the citywide revision of requirements for an academic diploma. This increased the number and grouping of necessary units and Regents courses required for this diploma starting with the graduating class of 1962.

Two preliminary studies were conducted in other schools by the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance in the spring of 1956 in order to secure additional comparative reference data for the Commission on Integration.[2]

---

[2] Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 7, December 6, 1957.

There were no plans to use a concurrent control group within Junior High School 43, Manhattan. The project was a demonstration program designed to help as many students as might possibly benefit from it. Limiting the program to half of the students selected would not only have defeated this aim but would also have been extremely difficult since the selection process was designed to be fluid and provision was made for easy movement into or out of the experimental groups throughout the junior high school years. Furthermore, even if it were possible to equate such a control group it is questionable whether it would have made the research any more rigorous since it would have been virtually impossible to insulate the control group from the program. The experience of the Bureau of Educational Research has shown that in this type of situation the school staff tends to adapt for all groups, insofar as possible, any of the experimental procedures it considers valuable and this overflow of the program into the control groups vitiates their value as controls.

PART II

THE PROJECT IN OPERATION

CHAPTER III

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS WITH ACADEMIC POTENTIAL

A. Selection of Students for the Project

The Bureau of Educational Research worked with Junior High School 43, Manhattan, and George Washington High School in planning and conducting the screening of students for the experimental classes in the junior high school and in selecting students who were to continue in the project at the senior high school.

Although most children in low socio-economic areas are penalized on the usual standardized tests, a moderate number do rate high on tests and show good achievement in school. There is no difficulty in identifying these children whose ability is obvious, even if its full extent is unknown. The students who present problems in identification are those with low test results and achievement. There are no sure ways to separate those whose performance could be raised from those whose achievement will remain low no matter how stimulating the teaching, guidance, and cultural experiences. Because of this uncertainty in prediction, it was decided, in line with the aims of the program, that it was preferable to make errors of inclusion rather than exclusion, and to try out many students whose aptitudes seemed borderline for success in the academic diploma course.

The basic conditions underlying the initial selection of students for the junior high school project were:

a. The distribution of potential was to be no different in this disadvantaged group than in the total population. If deprivations had been too deep and corroding, attempts to identify and stimulate potential in junior high school might have been too late, but the effort was to be made to see how much could still be done.

b. Approximately half the students in the junior high school were to be included in the program. Usually, for an unselected sample the top twenty-five to thirty per cent in ability is considered the high aptitude group, but there was to be a larger reservoir of students in the project because of the larger error of measurement for disadvantaged youth.

c. A variety of instruments and all possible clues were to be used to try to discover, among the students who did not measure up on conventional criteria, those students whose potential and talents were submerged.

d. Every student who showed a glimmer of hidden aptitude was to be included in the program, regardless of the poor prognosis of conventional tests and other indicators of potential.

e. The selection process was to be flexible and was to continue throughout the junior high school years. There was to be opportunity to shift students in or out of the program in junior high school as observations and evidence accumulated. The selection of the group to continue in the high school academic course was to be made toward the end of the ninth grade.

Selection of the Junior High School Project Students

Junior High School 43 had laid the groundwork for identification of the potentially able students with the selection in June 1956 of successful and definitely superior students for the two "top" class sections of each grade and had tentatively formed the experimental classes for September 1956. The school had also made preparatory tabulations of citywide test data and teacher comments about all pupils. The selection procedures to locate students with academic potential who might not ordinarily be identified had to be developed after the beginning of the school year since the project did not begin until September.

In September the school records of the previous citywide test results were reviewed to select those students who showed nearly average ability or better on conventional standardized tests. Those who had obtained IQ ratings of 90 or above on verbal intelligence tests, and reading and arithmetic scores no more than one year below grade, were considered as likely candidates for the experimental program. In the total student population in all three grades (seventh, eighth and ninth grades) 423 or 30 per cent of the students met at least two of these three criteria or were in the two top classes discussed above.

In order to locate additional students for inclusion in the experimental group, additional tests were administered to all students in the school, and teacher estimates of each pupil's academic potential were obtained. The plans for this screening survey were developed by the Bureau of Educational Research in consultation with the school. Teachers and counselors played a major role in carrying out the testing program and in assisting the research staff in the construction of instruments. Briefing sessions were held with teachers about the administration of each test. The project also had the assistance of a part-time psychologist to aid in selection.

Many tests, inventories, and rating scales were considered before those which seemed most practical for this situation were chosen. Since it was important to select the experimental students as rapidly as possible, only a few measures were used for the initial identification and other measures were employed later. The information collected served the following purposes:

a. To help in identification and in class placement.

b. To study the predictive value of a variety of measures in identification, including new "culture-fair" measures and teacher judgments.

c. To determine student status at the beginning of the project, and to serve as a basis for measuring later gains.

d. To learn more about the students' abilities, achievement, goals, aspirations, personality, and background in order to assist educational and guidance planning.

The project measurement program which was instituted to supplement the citywide verbal intelligence and achievement tests included several measures of potential and achievement:

1. The SRA Non-Verbal Form AH, a brief test of "nonverbal intelligence" using pictorial and geometric items and requiring no reading, was expected to measure another dimension of intellectual potential. This instrument was used as the first test because it was short, had appeal to students, would not threaten those whose reading or achievement was poor, and so might establish a positive attitude to the testing program. It was administered to all students. In the five class sections for students who did not speak English the directions were given in Spanish. After the experimental classes were fully organized, two other culture-fair tests, the IPAT Culture-Free Test and the Raven Progressive Matrices, were tried out with the experimental students of the class of 1959.

2. To obtain a measure of the students' educational achievement levels at the beginning of the project, the Stanford Intermediate or Advanced[1] Reading Test JM, and Arithmetic Test JM, were administered to all students except those who did not speak English or whose knowledge of English was too limited to enable them to take these tests. Because of the difficulties many of the students had in handling tests, a brief pretest to teach students how to use separate answer sheets for machine-scored tests was given about a week prior to the testing.

---

[1] The level of test given depended generally upon the students' level of performance on previous tests.

3. To have some indication of the achievement level of the Spanish-speaking students who had little or no command of English, the University of Puerto Rico Spanish Reading Test and the Puerto Rican Study Arithmetic Test were administered to these children.

4. A brief projective test, the "Draw-A-Person Test," known as the Human Figure Drawing, was given in all classes. Spanish directions were used with the Spanish-speaking students. The drawings were scanned by the psychologist for any additional clues about intellectual promise or emotional disturbance.

5. Immediately before the first school marking period, the official class teachers and major subject teachers were asked to rate each student's potential on a descriptive four-point scale, "Teacher Estimates of Student Potential," and to add any comments that would help in selection.

The results of the nonverbal intelligence test, achievement tests, and teacher ratings were used along with the earlier results of the verbal intelligence and achievement tests in a set of ten criteria. While this set was heavily weighted with conventional tests on which these pupils might rate low, the criterion on each test was a liberal minimum score that was met by approximately 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the total student body. Furthermore, the criteria were used not to eliminate, but rather to locate for possible inclusion, any students who met any one of the conventional or other criteria. Table 2 presents the criteria used to select students for the junior high school project classes.

TABLE 2

Criteria for Admission to Project Classes in Junior High School 43, Manhattan

Criteria	Minimum Score Acceptable	Criteria Values
Verbal IQ [a]	90	1
SRA Non-Verbal IQ	100	1
Three Reading test scores and Three arithmetic test scores [b]	Grade scores approximately 1 year below grade or better in 7th and 8th grades; and at least 7.0 at beginning 9th grade	3 3
Teacher ratings of potential	1 or 2 on a 4 point scale	2
	Total	10

[a] For most students the results available were on the Otis Quick Scoring Test, Beta, the citywide test given in sixth grade, or the Pintner Intermediate, the citywide test given in eighth grade. For some of the other students who did not have these scores, there were results of other verbal intelligence tests.

[b] One of each group of three was a citywide test, and two were subtests of the Stanford Achievement battery administered by the project in October 1956.

Any student who met four or more of these criteria was placed in an experimental class; 70 per cent of the students placed in these classes initially met this minimum. In addition, students who met fewer than four criteria were placed in the experimental group on the basis of good class marks, strong teacher recommendation, outstandingly high score on one of the criteria, marked improvement on tests or school work, a good early school record, other evidence from the record card or the psychologist, or some additional individual consideration.

The Bureau of Educational Research worked closely with Junior High School 43 in planning and carrying out the identification, leaving the ultimate selection and class placement to the school. Although the school attempted to make the section classes homogeneous in ability, factors other than academic potential had to be taken into account: whether the student was studying French or Spanish, his placement in a special art or music class, a serious emotional problem, or the unavailability of records and test data for newly admitted students.

The newly arrived students from Puerto Rico who were non-English speaking presented a special problem. These students in the five special class sections for pupils who did not speak English or whose command of English was still very limited had to be omitted from the experimental classes initially because of the language problem. However, some of these students showed apparent promise on the available test results[2] and on teacher ratings and were considered for experimental class placement when they were ready to join in English speaking classes. Six of these students (three in the 7th grade, three in the 8th grade) were placed in experimental classes during the year. Other students were added to experimental classes for September 1957.

The selection of students for the experimental classes took place from September to November 1956. Since it was considered inadvisable to delay a year for further preparation and planning, classes were reorganized in December, three months after the opening of the school year. In the long run, it was hoped that the positive contributions of the project would outweigh any negative effects of the reorganization of classes. Other unavoidable changes throughout the year resulting from the mobility of the population also complicated both teaching and selection. In the two months between the initial project testing in October 1956 and the official reorganization of classes in December 1956 there was nearly a 10 per cent turnover, with 75 students leaving the school and 55 new students entering it.

The project reorganization in December changed the class section placement of 221 of the 1377 students in the total school population at the time; only 93 of these changes involved moving students from non-experimental to experimental classes.

---

[2] In addition to the results on the tests administered by the project, there were data for some students on the Cooperative Inter-American Test of General Ability, Intermediate Form AS, and the Puerto Rican Study Oral Directions Test (a measure of ability to understand directions in English).

A total of 717 students (334 boys, 383 girls), 52.1 per cent of the total student body, were placed in the experimental classes when the reorganization was completed on December 17, 1956.

9th grade	240
8th grade	228
7SP class[3]	28
7th grade	221

With subsequent additions to the group, there were 914 pupils in experimental classes at some time during the three years of the program in the junior high school. As additional promising students were found among new admissions to the school or in the non-experimental classes they were added to the original experimental group. There were 197 such additions, mainly new admissions to the school: 112 regular admissions, 32 admissions to a newly formed SP class in September 1958, and 53 transfers from non-experimental classes. Specific class placements for the beginning of the second and third years of the project were determined on the basis of conferences of the administrators, the major subject teachers, counselors, and homeroom teachers of each class.

These additions to the experimental classes were balanced by the students who left these classes, either because they had moved and had been discharged to other schools, or because they had been unable to maintain themselves in these classes and had been transferred to non-experimental classes. Thus, the final number who entered high schools from the experimental classes during the three years was 720. Of these, 710 entered from ninth grade, and 10 entered specialized high schools from eighth grade. However, as will be explained below, 138 of these 720 students were rated as non-experimental when they were reevaluated at the end of ninth grade.

Further Selection for the George Washington High School Classes

All students in the Junior High School 43 experimental classes were reevaluated toward the end of ninth grade on the basis of their total performance, including new test data, class marks, and teacher estimates. In addition to the usual test data, several other scores were taken into consideration. These were the results of the Orleans Geometry Prognosis Test, algebra and foreign language tests, and, for the third class, two additional culture-fair tests. Teacher appraisal of each student was made on a four point scale.

---

[3] SP classes in the junior high schools are Special Progress classes of academically superior students. These classes complete the three year course in two years.

Those students with the first three ratings on the scale were classified as "experimental-caliber" students who, it was felt, would probably be able to maintain themselves in an academic course in senior high school with varying degrees of help. Those in the fourth rating were classified as "non-experimental" students because they were judged to have clearly insufficient potential for the academic course. The project group for the senior high school was formed on the basis of a further selection from the reclassified "experimental-caliber" group, which still included some students of possibly limited potential, in accordance with the philosophy of the project that in doubtful cases it was better to make errors of inclusion than to make errors of exclusion.

Table 3 includes the total numbers of (1) all students admitted to high schools from Junior High School 43 project and nonproject classes; (2) students from the project classes only who were admitted to high schools; (3) students finally rated "experimental" before entrance to high school.

TABLE 3

Admissions to Senior High Schools from Junior High School 43 Manhattan Classes of 1957, 1958, 1959

	Date Admitted	From J.H.S. Total Class	From J.H.S. Project Classes	Experimental on Final J.H.S. Rating
First Class	June 1957	439	235	198
Second Class	June 1958	416	250	199
Third Class	June 1959	426	235	195
Total		1281	720	592

Not all of those rated experimental went on with the project in high school. The group destined to continue in the project had to be further narrowed down because the program was conducted in one high school only, George Washington High School, and students were free to seek admission to other high schools. Approximately 42 per cent of the "experimental-caliber" students (31 per cent in the first class, 45 per cent in the second class, 47 per cent in the third class) actually did choose to attend a total of 27 other high schools.

The final decision for admission to the project was a joint agreement of the junior and senior high school principals, the project coordinators, the Bureau of Educational Research director and the research staff. The selection was made after a review of all the "experimental-caliber" students who applied to George Washington High School. After the first group, the grade nine class of 1957, qualifications were made more rigid and students were expected to meet minimum criteria set up by the Bureau of Educational Research on the basis of studies of the predictability of success in tenth grade.[4] These criteria are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Criteria for Admission to Project Classes
in George Washington High School

Criteria	Minimum Score Acceptable	Criteria Values
Junior High School grade average	65	2
Pintner IQ	90	1
SRA Non-Verbal IQ	100	1
Paragraph Meaning grade equivalent	7.0	1
Arithmetic Reasoning grade equivalent	6.5	1
	Total Criteria	6

Students failing to meet one or two criteria but having other compensating qualities were included in the high school project group. For the third group, decisions on doubtful cases also took into account results of a special prediction formula applied to them.

In the first two classes, admission to the high school project was limited to those qualified students applying to George Washington High School who elected the academic course. The students who elected any other course were not eligible for the project since a primary goal originally was to prepare and encourage project students to enter college. However, when it was decided to broaden the objectives of the project to help the project students who had been unable to maintain themselves in the college preparatory course, most of the students who changed to the commercial or general course were retained in the project.

---

[4] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Project Research Reports Nos. 13 and 26. (Mimeographed)

A total of 379 of the 592 experimental-caliber students were slated for admission to the George Washington High School project classes, 374 initially and 5 after first beginning in another high school. However, 14 of these did not actually enter the project since they moved and entered other senior high schools.

Table 5 presents the number of experimental-caliber students admitted to the senior high school project classes from Junior High School 43, Manhattan.

TABLE 5

Admissions to George Washington High School Project Classes

	J.H.S. Experimental on Final Rating	H.S. Project Admissions		
		Admitted to H.S.Project	Actually Entered H.S.Project	Remained at G.W.H.S.
First Class - 1957	198	148	143	131
Second Class- 1958	199	114	108	99
Third Class - 1959	195	117	114	99
Total	592	379	365	329

Altogether, in the three years, 365 students (161 boys, 204 girls) entered the three high school project classes. These students constituted 28 per cent of all the Junior High School 43 students and 62 per cent of the experimental-caliber students who entered high school. A larger number entered the first project class (143) than the second or third classes (108 and 114 respectively). The proportions of experimental students who entered the high school project were 72 per cent for the first class, 54 per cent in the second class, and 58 per cent for the third class. Among the senior high school project entrants, 15 in the second class and 13 in the third class came from SP classes in which they had completed the three year junior high school course in two years.

Some of the 365 who entered the project classes at George Washington High School later moved or transferred, leaving a total of 329 high school project entrants (144 boys, 185 girls) in this school. Of these, 307 remained in project classes (129 boys, 178 girls) and 22 were shifted by the school to nonproject classes after a year or more in the project classes.

The presentation in Chapter VIII of the final outcome of the senior high school project students is based on the 329 project entrants who did not transfer to other schools.

The Junior High School "Experimental" Students Who Were Not in the High School Project

A total of 227 of the 592 junior high school experimental students, or 38.3 per cent did not enter the high school project. They entered nonproject classes at George Washington High School or other senior high schools. Subsequently, the number increased to 263, because 36 students who had spent some time in the high school project either transferred to other schools in the city (14) or moved out of town (22). The final high school placements of the 263 students is as follows:

45 were in nonproject classes at George Washington High School.

167 were in other high schools in the city (14 of these had transferred into these schools after having been in the high school project).

51 were out of town or in private schools (22 of these had spent some time in the high school project).

Forty-one of the experimental students who did not enter the high school project had been admitted from eighth grade (10) or ninth grade (31) to academic high schools which required them to pass special entrance examinations. Since one aim of the project was to stimulate qualified students to enter these schools, the detailed data on the schools entered are presented below in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Junior High School Experimental Students Who Entered Special Academic High Schools

	First Class Class of 1957	Second Class Class of 1958	Third Class Class of 1959	Total
Bronx H. S. of Science	4	5	5	14
Brooklyn Technical H.S.	-	4	1	5
Stuyvesant H. S.	-	5	4	9
H.S. of Music and Art	1	5	4	10
H.S. of Performing Arts	1	2	-	3
Total	6	21	14	41

Summary of the Classification of Students Through the Project Years

The number of students in the various aspects of the Demonstration Guidance Project during the years 1956 to 1962 is presented below.

717 students, 52 per cent of the total student body, were selected initially and placed in experimental classes. The 197 additional admissions into these classes during the three years in the junior high school were almost balanced by the students who transferred or were discharged.

720 students entered senior high schools from these experimental classes.

First Class: 235　　Second Class: 250　　Third Class: 235

561 students went on to senior high schools from the non-experimental classes in Junior High School 43.

582 of the 720 students, upon reevaluation before they went on to senior high school, were rated by the junior high school as having sufficient academic promise to be considered of experimental caliber in the senior high school.

First Class: 198　　Second Class: 199　　Third Class: 195

10 students in the non-experimental junior high school classes were rated as being of experimental caliber at the end of grade nine.

138 students who went on to senior high schools from experimental classes were rated as non-experimental at the end of grade nine by the junior high school. These 138 students plus the 561 students who entered high school from non-experimental classes make up the total group of 689 students who, at the end of grade nine, were rated as not being of experimental caliber since they did not have sufficient academic promise to be included in the senior high school project.

379 of the 592 experimental caliber students were accepted by George Washington High School for project classes in the senior high school

213 junior high school project students rated experimental caliber by the junior high school at the end of grade nine were judged by George Washington High School not to have sufficiently high academic potential to continue in their senior high school project classes.[5]

---

[5] There were two evaluations of the students made at the end of grade nine. The first was made by the Bureau of Educational Research and the Junior High School 43 staff (pages 28, 29, this chapter). A second evaluation made principally by George Washington High School narrowed this group still further (pages 29-31, this chapter).

14 of the junior high school project students who had been accepted for the senior high school project classes transferred without entering the project.

227 students therefore, who were rated experimental caliber by the junior high school at the end of grade nine, did not enter the senior high school project classes.

365 students entered the senior high school project classes. They constituted 62 per cent of the junior high school project students and 28 per cent of all the Junior High School 43 students who entered senior high school.

First Class: 143 Second Class: 108 Third Class: 114

329 of the 365 senior high school project students remained in George Washington High School to the end of grade twelve.
The data in the Chapter VIII discussion of the final outcome of the project students are based on those 329 students who remained in George Washington High School

36 of the 365 senior high school project student entrants transferred or moved away.

307 of the 329 senior high school project students remained in the project classes to the end of grade twelve.

First Class: 131 Second Class: 99 Third Class: 99

22 of the senior high school project students were transferred to other non-experimental classes in George Washington High School.

First Class: 15 Second Class: 7 Third Class: 0

B. Abilities of Junior High School Project Students as Revealed by Selection Criteria

The medians presented in Table 7 indicate the status of each of the three junior high school project classes (the classes of 1957, 1958 and 1959) at the beginning of the project on some of the instruments used in the initial selection.[6] (On the Stanford Achievement Tests given in October 1956, the adjusted grade norm for New York City was 8.8 at the beginning of the ninth grade, 7.8 at the beginning of the eighth grade and 6.8 at the beginning of the seventh grade because New York City students were younger, on the average, than students in these grades nationally.)

---

[6] cf., Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Report No. 20.

TABLE 7

Medians on Tests Used in Selection of 717 Project Students in Junior High School 43 Manhattan

	First Class	Second Class		Third Class
	Class of 1957	Class of 1958		Class of 1959
	Grade 9	Grade 8	7SP [a]	Grade 7
	N 240	N 228	N 28	N 221
eneral Aptitude				
Verbal IQ [b]	87.4	94.3	134.2	96.1
SRA Nonverbal IQ 10/56	107.6	106.9	124.8	105.1
tanford Intermediate or dvanced Reading JM 10/56				
Paragraph Meaning grade equivalent	7.6	6.1	8.8	5.1
Word Meaning grade equivalent	8.0	6.7	9.6	5.5
Adjusted norm when tested	(8.8)	(7.8)	(6.8)	(6.8)
tanford Intermediate or Advanced rithmetic JM 10/56				
Arithmetic Reasoning grade equivalent	7.0	6.8	8.4	5.7
Arithmetic Computations grade equivalent	6.7	6.2	7.7	5.5
Adjusted norm when tested	(8.8)	(7.8)	(6.8)	(6.8)
eacher Ratings of Academic otential 11/56				
(highest rating: 1, lowest rating: 4)	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.3
otal number of criteria met (out of possible 10)	5.2	5.5	9.9	5.2

---

[a] The SP class data is given separately here since these students were n the seventh grade at the time, but would graduate with the second class hich was in eighth grade at the time of testing.

[b] The verbal test results available for most students in the first class ere the Pintner Intermediate, Form B, from the eighth grade, and in the other lasses the best results available were the Otis Quick Scoring, Beta, from he sixth grade.

On the conventional verbal intelligence tests the median IQs were all below 100: 87.4 on the Pintner for the first group, 94.3 and 96.1 on the Otis Quick Scoring Beta Test for the second and third groups respectively. On the other hand, on the SRA Non-Verbal Test all three classes had median IQs above 100: 107.6, 106.9, and 105.1 for the first, second, and third groups respectively. The medians on the nonverbal tests were at least nine points higher than those on the verbal test. The smallest difference between the verbal and nonverbal IQ results was in the third group, the largest in the first group. In the first group the median SRA nonverbal IQ was twenty points higher than the median IQ on the Pintner.

On two other "culture-fair" tests which were administered later to the third class only, the medians were also higher than those on the verbal tests. The median on the IPAT Culture- Free Intelligence Test, Scale 2, Form A, was 106.5. On the Raven Progressive Matrices 1938 (Revised Order 1956) a British test, the median raw score obtained was slightly above the 50th percentile on norms based on British subjects.[7]

Individual student scores for the 717 students ran from very low to very high on both the verbal and nonverbal tests, with verbal IQs ranging from 61 to 155 and the SRA nonverbal IQs from 60 to 140. Nearly two-thirds (64.5 per cent) of the students had verbal IQs below 100 with 24.2 per cent below 85, while less than one-third (30.6 per cent) showed nonverbal IQs below 100 with 8.8 per cent below 85. At the other end of the ability scale nearly one-fifth of the students (19.6 per cent) obtained IQ ratings above 110 on the verbal tests and more than two-fifths (44.2 per cent) were above 110 on the nonverbal tests.

On the Stanford Achievement Test administered in October 1956 the adjusted grade norm in New York City was 8.8 at the beginning of ninth grade, 7.8 at the beginning of eighth grade, and 6.8 at the beginning of seventh grade because New York City students were younger, on the average, than students in these grades nationally. In each of the three experimental groups the median grade equivalent score obtained on each of the four subtests was below the adjusted norm. All but one of the twelve medians were at least 1.0 year below grade. They ranged from 0.8 to 2.1 years below grade. The differences between median scores and adjusted grade norms are presented in Table 8.

---

[7] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 17. (Mimeographed)

TABLE 8

Differences Between Median Grade Equivalent Scores of Experimental Classes and the Adjusted Grade Norms

Stanford Achievement Subtest	First Class Ninth Grade	Second Class Eighth Grade	Third Class Seventh Grade
Paragraph Meaning	-1.2	-1.7	-1.7
Word Meaning	-0.8	-1.1	-1.3
Arithmetic Reasoning	-1.8	-1.0	-1.1
Arithmetic Computation	-2.1	-1.6	-1.3

There was a very wide range of individual student scores from below third grade to twelfth grade, with about a nine year variation in each grade in reading and a six to eight year span in arithmetic.

At the end of the first junior high school project year (June 1956) the project students were rated by their teachers. In the grade nine class, 9[illegible] per cent of the students were rated "1" (very good potential) or "2" (good potential) by one or more teachers. For both the grade eight class and grade seven class, 90 per cent of the students were given these ratings. Each student was also given an average rating based on the ratings he received from all of his teachers. These medians also indicate good potential.

While the ten criteria set for selection were very liberal, the median number of criteria met by the students was only somewhat over half of the ten. Approximately 70 per cent of the group met four or more of the ten criteria.

C. Abilities of Senior High School Project Students as Revealed by Selection Criteria

The results on selected measures show how 365 junior high school experimental students who eventually entered the senior high school project were functioning at the end of grade nine. By the time they had entered high school all three groups had taken the Pintner Intermediate Test of General Ability, Verbal Series, in the eighth grade, and the Stanford Reading and Arithmetic Achievement tests in the ninth grade. The SRA Non-Verbal Form AH was given to all three groups at the time the project started in 1956. In addition, ratings were made by the teachers of the academic potential of the project students as each group became ready for senior high school. The results of these tests are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Medians on Selected Tests and Ratings of 365 Entrants
To High School Project
(Including 27 Entrants from SP Classes)

	First Class N 143	Second Class N 108	Third Class N 114
General Aptitude			
Pintner Intermediate Verbal IQ	93.3	97.8	96.8
SRA Non-Verbal IQ	109.5	110.3	111.6
Stanford Paragraph Meaning, J or JM			
Grade Equivalent Score	8.7	8.4	10.3[b]
(Adjusted Norm when tested)[a]	(8.8)	(8.8)	(9.4)
Stanford Arithmetic Reasing Test, JM			
Grade Equivalent Score	7.3	7.8	8.5
(Adjusted Norm when tested)[a]	(8.8)	(8.8)	(8.8)
Teacher Ratings of Academic Potential in Ninth Grade (1 highest, 4 lowest rating)	1.8	1.7	2.0

[a] The grade norm was adjusted to the younger age of students in New York City school compared with those in ninth grade nationally.

[b] The third group received this test in April of the ninth grade while the other two classes were tested in October.

Although the median IQs for all three entering groups were below 100 on the Pintner Intermediate Verbal Test they tended nonetheless to approximate the average. All three median IQs were above average on the SRA Non-Verbal test. The medians on this latter test for the three classes were approximately twelve to sixteen points higher than those on the verbal test.

The wide range of individual scores is clear from the distribution in Table 10.

TABLE 10

High School Project Entrants' IQs on Pintner Intermediate
Verbal Test, and SRA Nonverbal Test
Administered at Junior High School 43, Manhattan

IQ	Pintner Intermediate First Class	Second Class	Third Class	SRA Non-Verbal First Class	Second Class	Third Class
130+	3	7	6	7	5	7
120 - 129	5	5	8	14	19	24
110 - 119	13	9	9	49	27	20
100 - 109	19	22	21	42	21	18
90 - 99	48	33	34	20	16	17
80 - 89	28	16	21	7	7	8
70 - 79	20	7	4	-	3	1
Below 70	-	-	1	1	-	1
Total Tested	136	99	104	140	98	96
No Data	7	9	10	3	10	18

The students rated better in reading than in arithmetic reasoning. On the paragraph meaning test the medians were one month below grade in the first class, four months below grade in the second class and nine months above grade in the third class. On the arithmetic reasoning test, the first two classes were a year or more below grade, 1.5 and 1.0 years respectively, while the third class was only three months below grade. On both tests in ninth grade the third class achieved at a higher level than the other two classes.

As shown in Table 11, in all three classes there was a very wide range of individual scores with a span of at least seven years and, in one instance, nine years. In each class on both the reading and arithmetic tests some students obtained twelfth grade scores. The lowest ratings were at the third, fourth, or fifth grade levels.

TABLE 11

High School Project Entrants' Achievement in Ninth Grade on Stanford Paragraph Meaning, and Arithmetic Reasoning

Grade Equivalent[a]	Paragraph Meaning First 10/56	 Second 10/57	 Third 4/59	Arithmetic Problems First 10/56	 Second 10/57	 Third 10/58
12.0+	9	4	16	2	1	3
11.0 - 11.9	8	7	22	8	1	8
10.0 - 10.9	24	22	30	4	13	23
9.0 - 9.9	20	12	12	11	17	16
8.0 - 8.9	22	24	13	24	16	18
7.0 - 7.9	24	19	9	38	28	19
6.0 - 6.9	16	8	3	30	26	20
5.0 - 5.9	8	5	1	18	3	5
4.0 - 4.9	4	3	-	2	-	1
3.0 - 3.9	2	-	-	-	-	-
Total Tested	137	104	106	137	105	113

[a] Adjusted norm is 8.8 in all cases except Paragraph Meaning for the third class in which instance it is 9.4 since that test was administered in April of the year rather than October.

In paragraph reading approximately 30 per cent of the first two groups and 42 per cent of the third group scored at least 1.2 years above grade with scores of 10.0 or above. At the other end of the scale approximately 30 per cent of the first two groups and 12 per cent of the third group scored 1.3 years or more below grade.

In arithmetic reasoning, proportionately fewer students than in reading scored at or above 10.0 and proportionately more scored below 7.5, particularly in the first group.

The median teacher ratings of the academic potential of these students in the ninth grade were 1.8, 1.7, and 2.0 for the first, second, and third groups, indicating good to very good potential.

Final evaluation of the individual senior high school project entrants was made by the counselors and the project coordinator. They estimated that approximately 30 per cent of these students had good ability and achievement and would probably succeed without special help, approximately 40 per cent might need a little remedial help, and approximately 30 per cent might need a good deal of help to maintain themselves in the academic course.

The senior high school project group, as a group, was not superior in terms of the usual standards. The nonverbal intelligence test results and the final teacher and counselor ratings in ninth grade indicated that these students had good potential but on conventional intelligence and achievement tests the groups still scored below average, except for the third class in reading. On all measures there was a wide range of individual differences and some students scored high even on the conventional tests. Thus, approximately one-fifth of the students who entered the three project classes at George Washington High School obtained Pintner Verbal IQ ratings of 110 or above and more than one-third of the students were reading more than a year above grade on the Stanford paragraph meaning test in ninth grade.

The group which went on to the senior high school project was very much better than the original junior high school experimental group had been initially in reading and was somewhat superior to that group on most measures, although it had about the same percentage of students with verbal IQs of 110 or over. The differences were no doubt due in large part to the successive screenings out of the project at the end of grade nine of those students who were judged to have insufficient academic potential for continuance in the senior high school project. In addition, there was an improvement in reading resulting from the project program in the junior high school. When the students were first tested at the inception of the project in 1956, the three experimental classes had a median paragraph meaning score that was more than a year below the adjusted grade norm. On the other hand, the medians for the high school project entrants when they were in the ninth grade were only one month below grade for the first class, four months below for the second class, and nine months above the adjusted grade norm for the third class.

There were differences among the three project classes but no class was consistently higher or lower on all measures. The third project class showed better achievement on tests in the ninth grade than the other two classes, was the only class to attain a median above the norm on the paragraph reading test, and almost reached the norm on the arithmetic reasoning test. However, the third project class was not better than the other classes on teacher ratings or the counselors' final estimate.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROJECT PROGRAM IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 43, MANHATTAN

Guidance

The guidance program began with the opening of the 1956 school year in September even though other aspects of the special instructional program did not get under way until three and a half months later in December. The project staff felt that it was urgent to embark on an immediate intensive program of raising the educational and vocational aspirations of the junior high school students. For the students with academic potential, the first step was to develop an image of self as able to advance above the educational and vocational levels of family and friends through the completion of high school and college or other post-high school training.

The guidance activities for the experimental group were carried out by the three special counselors assigned to the project with the assistance of the project coordinator who had previously served as guidance counselor to the Junior High School 43 students.

Group Guidance

The usual practice in the junior high schools is that teacher-counselors teach the weekly group guidance classes. However, it was decided that for the purposes of the project, it would be more effective if these classes were taught by the guidance counselors. Teaching the students they counseled individually would provide for the counselors a regular, continuing contact with each student, and would also yield added insight into classroom adjustment and peer relationships. This additional function for the guidance counselors was made possible by a reduction in the number of students assigned to each counselor so that the counselor-pupil ratio was approximately 1 to 275.

Beginning early in the seventh grade, much stress was placed on careers and career planning. Newspaper advertisements for professional and technical workers were used as the springboard for a thorough investigation of the opportunities within each occupational area. The advertisements demonstrated the importance of a college or other post-high school education for young people seeking jobs in today's labor market.

Individual self-rating scales were developed by means of which the students periodically evaluated their progress not only in various subject areas but also in the development of interests, in personal and social development, and in civic responsibility.

The program also included the presentation of factual data concerning the various senior high schools in New York City and the courses they offered their students. It was explained that students wishing academic courses should plan to attend George Washington High School in order that they might benefit from the special services which would be available there as part of the experimental project until their graduation from senior high school.

A regular feature of the group guidance classes was the use of audio-visual aids. Films relating to the various professions, the challenge of high school and college, how to study, leisure time activities, family and peer relationships, and personal development were shown and discussed.

In the ninth grade, additional group guidance activities included discussions of school record forms, senior high school applications, employment forms, and school reports to employers.

The group guidance period was also used for the administration of questionnaires designed to help the counselors understand the students better, to aid educational and vocational planning, and to serve the research purposes of the project. Inclusion of these activities in the group guidance periods gave assurance not only of uniformity of administration but also of appropriate preparation and stimulation of interest in the activity.

During September and October of the first year, each student wrote a brief composition outlining plans for his life's work along with his opinion as to the probability that he would be able to reach these goals. This was followed by a brief questionnaire, "About Me and My Plans," which was constructed for the project by the research staff in consultation with the counselors, the psychologist, the social worker, and the project coordinator. These instruments provided information about each student's goals, his impression of his parents' goals for him, the educational and vocational background of the family and some clues as to the family's economic status. Later in the year a longer questionnaire, "Your Educational Plans," helped to provide, along with other information previously gathered, a more complete picture of the aspirations and motivations of the students. The Mooney Problem Check List, which was administered along with this questionnaire, was used to help indicate students with special problems. These two instruments were administered again during the third year of the project to the third project group which was then in the ninth grade. In the spring of each year the Brainard Occupational Preference Inventory was administered to the project group that was in the ninth grade in order to obtain a uniform measure of occupational interests before students entered high school. This helped the counselors advise students about their choice of courses for senior high school and also provided additional data for students seeking admission to technical courses in special high schools.

Individual Counseling

Each student in the experimental classes had at least one interview each year with his counselor. From 42 per cent to 53 per cent had multiple interviews ranging from two to twenty for a total of 4,145 interviews during the three year period. Not included in these figures are

2 OF 3

ED001752

1.0
4.5
5.0
5.6
6.3
7.1
8.0
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
2.5
2.2
2.0
1.1
1.8
1.25
1.4
1.6

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963

the many brief contacts of less than ten minutes duration which served a variety of purposes such as the dispensing of information and pamphlets.

Where student problems existed, they fell into five major categories: educational, home and family, vocational, personal-social adjustment, and health. The educational problems of greatest frequency involved learning difficulties in one or more subject areas, poor study techniques, unhappiness about class transfer, and uncertainty in selection of the appropriate senior high school or senior high school courses. A broken home, friction between child and parent or guardian, inadequate housing, and financial difficulties were the areas of greatest frequency in the home and family category. Vocationally, the students were primarily interested in securing part-time jobs and in obtaining more information about careers to help them in their planning. In the area of personal-social adjustment, inability to get along with teachers, peers and parents was noted most frequently. Health problems were varied with no single area predominating.

The counselors attempted to help children with these problems through a succession of interviews. Where necessary, conferences were held with parents, teachers, nurse, and administrators, and referrals were made to school or outside agencies for specialized help. In this connection there were approximately 1,634 contacts with parents, 45 referrals to social agencies, clinics, recreational centers, Department of Welfare, Department of Housing, and Youth Board. There were 52 referrals to the project social worker and 67 to the project psychologist.

Counselors held regularly scheduled conferences with the homeroom teacher of each experimental class. These were frequent enough to allow for an exchange of information about each project student at least twice per year. Additional conferences were held as the need arose.

Assembly Program

Approximately one assembly program a month was devoted to some aspect of guidance. There were speakers from colleges, nursing schools, and industrial concerns, as well as former graduates from Junior High School 43 who had gone on to George Washington High School. Provision was made for small group discussions following each of these programs. Other assembly programs were devoted to original skits written by students or panel discussions related to school and family life, high school planning, and choice of career.

Trips Within the Guidance Program

As a regular feature of the school program prior to the project, students from Junior High School 43 had taken occasional trips to high schools, neighboring hospitals, and industrial concerns as part of their orientation to the world of work. This program was expanded

2

during the project years to include visits to colleges, universities, and research centers. A special planning conference between the coordinator or counselor and the college, hospital, or center to be visited made these trips more meaningful. Many students entered the laboratories with some knowledge gained from reading in their area of interest. In the colleges the students observed and sometimes actually participated in the work of the classes they visited. Additional interviews or trips were arranged for individual students who exhibited more specialized interests. In one year trips were taken to seven colleges or universities, five hospitals and nursing schools, and two research centers.

Student Reaction to the Guidance Program

During the final month of the first year, the students were asked their opinion of the total guidance program. The ninth grade pupils wrote their comments and the seventh and eighth grade pupils gave their reactions orally. Students of all grades expressed their appreciation of the availability of counselors with whom they could discuss their problems. Ninth grade students were particularly pleased with the arrangements made for them to receive remedial help when they needed it and the information they received regarding senior high school courses and careers. Eighth grade students seemed to have had greatest interest in the discussion of teen-age problems and seventh graders wanted more information about careers. The reaction of the seventh grade students is important since there was a new emphasis placed on career information as part of the project guidance program in this grade.

Clinical Services

During the first year of the project, 1956-1957, the junior high school had the services of a psychologist and a social worker for one and one-half days a week each. They were able to function as a clinic team since their schedule was arranged so that they were in school on the same days.

The psychologist and the social worker, either together or separately, held regular conferences with the project coordinator. At the outset of the project, the psychologist, members of the research staff, and the coordinator met weekly to formulate plans for early identification and selection procedures. There were numerous clinic staff conferences at the Northside Center for Child Development with Dr. Kenneth Clark who directed the clinical program for the school year 1956-57.

In September 1957, the clinical program was transferred to the Bureau of Child Guidance of the New York City Board of Education. Since the original grade nine project class was by that time in senior high school, clinical services for the junior high school were reduced to one day a week each for the psychologist and the social worker.

Psychological Services

The scope of the psychological services available to the project is indicated by the following description of the cases referred to the psychologist during the first project year: One third of the 48 cases concerned the placement of students into the special progress class where they were to complete the three year junior high school program in two years. The remaining thirty-two cases fell into varied categories. One student might seem to have a higher capacity than group tests indicated, while another might evidence withdrawn behavior. In several instances, the Human Figure Drawing suggested pathology. Twenty-two of these students received the full psychological battery consisting of an interview and the following tests: Wechler Intelligence Scale for Children, Bender Gestalt Test, and Rorschach Test.

During the second year a group therapy program was developed for six of the students who had been referred for psychological examination. This small group, which met after school, was very enthusiastic, and problems involving parent-child relationships were heatedly discussed.

Social Work Services

Students were referred to the project social worker for a wide variety of reasons, such as poor academic performance despite good potential, flagrant misbehavior in class, concern about the family situation, and serious financial need. The severity of the problems ranged from long-standing and deep-seated personality disturbance to conflict and tension caused by environmental factors.

The social worker also met with the students going to George Washington High School to discuss with them the future availability of clinical services.

Social Instructional Program

After the selection procedures had been completed, the project students were grouped according to reading level and academic achievement so that classes would be as homogeneous as possible. Exceptions were made in cases where a student had made a particularly good adjustment in a class of more able students. There was no reduction in the registers of the experimental classes. Six of the seven ninth grade classes took a foreign language and six took ninth year mathematics. Six of the seven eighth grade classes took a foreign language. All of the junior high school project classes followed the usual course of study geared to the ability level of each class.

All teachers were encouraged to integrate worthwhile trips and other forms of enrichment into the curriculum. The seventh grade students who were studying New York State in social studies class were given an opportunity to gain additional knowledge of the Hudson River Valley at first hand. They traveled by bus from the school to Hyde Park, New York, where they visited the home of Franklin D. Roosevelt. For many, this was their first experience outside New York City.

In order to give the ninth grade students a better understanding of different countries for their study of world geography, letters were written to 31 different consulates inviting them to send a speaker, dancer, or musician to the school. Many agreed to do so. Denmark, Australia, the Netherlands, India, and Ireland were among those that sent both a representative and an entertainer. Another experience provided in conjunction with the social studies curriculum for the ninth grade project students was a visit to the World Trade Fair.

Science teachers arranged for visits to the Sloan-Kettering Medical Research Center and the Atomic Energy Center at Brookhaven.

In order to arouse further interest in reading, the school rented various films which were shown to classes during their English periods. Among those shown were: Les Miserables, Tale of Two Cities, Mutiny on The Bounty, Arrowsmith, and David Copperfield. When War and Peace, Moby Dick, and The Red Badge of Courage were shown at theatres in the neighborhood, a lesson was prepared which presented the salient facts of the story, pointed out things to look for, and gave suggestions for further study. These movies were followed up in class. Similar preparations were made for worthwhile TV programs.

Each year about 1000 books were purchased at a discount by students through special school orders. With each book purchased, a personalized book plate was given to encourage the building of a personal library. Fine books in every subject area were offered to the students. Lists were circulated among the teachers of English who were responsible for eliciting the interest of the students. Later, at the annual Book Fair, the better books had a much wider sale than in previous years.

Remedial Services

In addition to the curriculum enrichment which was available for all students, remedial assistance was provided for the 329 students who were retarded 1.3 years or more in reading and the 341 students who were similarly retarded in arithmetic.

During the first year, two teachers were assigned to remedial reading and two were assigned to remedial arithmetic. Each met with groups of six children for a forty-five minute period of instruction four times a week. Students who gave indications of being able to come up to grade level with the least amount of help were given priority for admission to the remedial classes. A student needing special assistance in both subject areas could take only one at a time.

In order to overcome the difficulties of scheduling periods so that students would not be taken from English or mathematics classes at any time, from other major subjects more than once a week, or from minor subjects which they enjoyed, a limited experiment with split half-classes in English and mathematics was tried during the second year. One homeroom class was divided between two English teachers or between two mathematics teachers. The upper 60 per cent of the students covered the course of study plus enrichment while the lower 40 per cent covered the course of study with emphasis on the necessary remedial aspects. In each case, the teacher of the lower group was trained in remedial techniques. Provision was still made for some small group remedial instruction in reading. A more flexible plan was followed for the second year arithmetic program where pupils were given a period or more of individual or small group tutoring as specific difficulties arose. This was particularly valuable in cases of protracted absence or inter-class changes. There was no limit to the number of tutoring sessions available to any one child.

During the summer of 1957, 48 seventh and eighth grade students attended two classes set up for them in the Summer School for Reading. This is a summer program set up by the New York City Board of Education for children who need special help with reading skills.

The remedial plan for foreign languages during the first two project years was the same as the first year remedial reading and arithmetic plan, except that the total number of students involved was fewer. During the third year, the split class basis was also adopted for foreign languages. Students whose native tongue was Spanish were grouped together so that they might proceed with an accelerated program.

After-school facilities were set up in a further attempt to extend remedial services and also to provide a place for doing homework for those without suitable accommodations at home. Coaching service in mathematics was advertised widely throughout the school by means of posters and teacher recommendations. The students knew that twice weekly, from 3:00 to 4:00 o'clock, there would be a quiet room with a mathematics teacher ready and willing to help them with homework and other difficulties. Once a week, in the same room, there was a foreign language teacher available to help them. In addition, a small corps of ninth grade project students served as teacher assistants with gratifying results to their "students." As an additional bonus these assistant teachers gained a great deal from the experience of teaching.

It was noted that those students who received the special remedial services showed several gains: general improvement in adjustment to school, better attendance records, greater interest in work, increased attention span, and heightened self-confidence. For example, many normally bright children who had built up an antagonism toward mathematics showed a lessening of these feelings. In general, as timidity and fears were reduced, scores rose, and improvement in regular class work was reported by the teachers.

Cultural Enrichment Program

Junior High School 43 initiated an extensive program of cultural enrichment designed to meet the needs of the project students, the majority of whom had little opportunity to participate in many of the cultural activities which are an integral part of the everyday experiences of children in more favored communities. The program was designed to help these children learn to enjoy good music, films, and plays, and to recognize and appreciate fine art. In addition, they were to be given an opportunity to learn about New York City and its resources.

For all theatre and concert experiences, as well as for all prepared assembly programs, a lesson plan or preparation flyer was drawn up and given to each teacher to be adapted to suit the specific needs of his class. The student was told what to look for and given the necessary background information. Following the actual experience there was a review or discussion of what had been seen or heard. Follow-up questions to help the teacher were included in the original lesson plan.

Much work had to be done to prepare the students for the first concert. Students who had had no experience with concerts were reluctant to attend, feeling that the recordings heard in class were sufficient. Parents were reluctant to permit children to travel downtown. Also, many did not want their children to give up Saturday jobs or objected to losing their assistance at home. In an effort to overcome these objections, interviews were held with students, parents, and employers. Students who could not afford to pay admission fees and carfare were subsidized by the Scholarship Fund.

Each class was invited to several planned out-of-school cultural activities. Students who did not avail themselves of these invitations nonetheless profited from being in the classroom when preparatory and follow-up lessons were given. The trip itself, by subway or bus, served as a cultural experience since few of the students had ever traveled far from home. Sometimes other visits were combined with the major activity.

For example, students visited the Art Students League after a Philharmonic concert at Carnegie Hall and browsed around Fourth Avenue book stalls on their way to the Phoenix Theatre to see The Taming of the Shrew.

A survey of student reaction to the cultural activities program showed that in the long run, the more cultural experiences a student had, the more he wanted. However, it was difficult to get the students actively interested in activities to which they were unaccustomed. For many of the students, the only way this could be accomplished was by providing for their expenses. With the help of funds available to the project, it was possible to arrange many cultural experiences on a full class basis.

A brief summary of cultural events available to project students during the 1957-58 school year gives a good idea of the scope and popularity of the program. At the Metropolitan Opera House, groups of about 40 students attended Don Carlo, Tosca, La Perichole, Carmen, and La Boheme, and smaller groups attended three working rehearsals. Many groups went to the City Center and the Town Hall where they heard opera in brief form. Eighty subscription tickets were purchased for the Carnegie Hall series of concerts presented by the Young Peoples' Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra. In addition, 150 students obtained tickets for three extra concerts and 35 students attended a rehearsal of the Magnificat with the New York Philharmonic and the Scuola Cantorum.

Among the Broadway plays seen by class groups were Sunrise at Campobello, Inherit the Wind, Diary of Anne Frank, and the Old Vic performance of Twelfth Night. Off Broadway plays included Mary Stuart, Me Candido, and The Crucible. Two professional companies were invited to the school. One performed scenes from Shaw's Man of Destiny and the other presented Treasure Isle, a musical play based on Stevenson's Treasure Island.

Groups of children saw the New York City Ballet Company production of Nutcracker Suite, and performances by the Beriozka Russian Folk Ballet, and the Jose Greco Dance Company. At the 92nd Street YMHA they saw recitals given by the Japanese Noh Dancers and various other dance groups.

Large groups of students saw the following films: Henry V, Bridge on the River Kwai, Around the World in 80 Days, Old Man and the Sea, and South Sea Cinerama. These were in addition to the films shown in connection with the project English classes.

Classes visited the Museum Village at Smith's Cove, Monroe, N.Y., and Sleepy Hollow Restoration at Tarrytown. Prior to the latter visit, a guest lecturer came to the junior high school to discuss with the students the history and importance of Sleepy Hollow.

In order to encourage students who showed an intense interest in astronomy, scholarships were provided so that six of them could attend a series of Saturday morning lectures at Hayden Planetarium. The students went singly or in groups without teacher escort. This was the first major break-through in having the students participate in worthwhile cultural or educational activities on their own.

Reaching and Influencing Parents

Parent cooperation is essential in motivating students to seek higher education. For this reason it was initially proposed that every attempt be made to reach the parents of project students. A variety of group and individual techniques was used. Some were based on existing procedures while others were developed specifically for the project.

Group Methods

Early in the first year of the project a series of parents' meetings was initiated. One afternoon meeting on each grade level was set up for the project parents. An additional evening meeting was arranged for parents who were unable to attend the afternoon meeting for their child's grade. Parents with small children were invited to bring them to the meetings, and provisions were made to care for them in the kindergarten. Short talks were given by the principal, the assistant-to-principal, the project coordinator, and guidance personnel. They spoke about the overall objectives of the project, the responsibilities of the school and the parents in accomplishing these objectives, the special remedial and guidance services available, and the need for cooperation between parents and school. This was followed by a question period after which the teachers joined the group for refreshments and a brief discussion with each parent of his child's achievement and progress.

A series of workshops concerned with future careers for project students was conducted for the parents by each grade counselor. A resource person with specialized knowledge of scholarship sources and college requirements was present for each of the workshop meetings.

School personnel assisted the Parents' Association in planning evening programs. The students who had been awarded scholarships by the National Scholarship Service Fund for Negro Students were invited to one of the evening meetings of the Parents' Association. They spoke about the costs of a college education and the possibilities of students receiving full or partial scholarships. One of the speakers pointed out that although the combined income of his parents was less than $4,000, they had been able to send their four children to college.

There was a constant effort on the part of project personnel to communicate to the parents that the education of their children was a cooperative venture. Administrators and guidance personnel were available at all parents' meetings to describe new developments in the program. In addition, all parents were constantly kept informed of the various activities being offered to their children. A Parent Questionnaire was constructed by the research staff in consultation with the principal and the guidance staff, and approved by the Parents' Association.[1]

---

[1] See Appendix B.

This questionnaire gave parents an opportunity to request an interview with their child's grade counselor.

Individual Contacts with Parents

During the first year more than 850 individual contacts, in person or by telephone, were made with parents to enlist their cooperation in helping their children realize their potentialities and to acquaint the parents with the goals of the project. It was difficult to reach many of the parents, either individually or in groups. Many had a long work day and were too tired after work, and others had to care for young children. One counselor, a resident of the community, made home visits on Sunday to reach parents who could not otherwise be seen.

During the second year, although counselors continued to see students whenever necessary, attention was focused on parent interviews in an attempt to see the parents of each of the 500 experimental students still in junior high school project classes. The counselors succeeded in seeing approximately 92 per cent of these parents at least once. Many of them had to make sacrifices to come to school; some took time off from work while others arranged for appointments early in the morning before regular school hours so that they could come in on their way to work.

Special Study of Hard-to-Reach Parents

A study was made of the small group of parents (8 per cent of the total) who were not seen by the counselors during the second year of the project. These were parents who either said they could not come to school or who did not respond at all to the counselors' repeated attempts to see them. Twenty-five of these parents were visited by the research assistant.

The parents varied in background. and in aspirations and expectations for their children. In general, it was found that the higher the educational status of the parents, the higher were their aspirations for their children. While a few of the group of parents with the lowest level of education were motivated toward having their children attend college because they themselves had not had the opportunity, the rest of this group wanted them to learn some practical skill or trade. However, the majority of the parents interviewed had high educational aspirations for their children. Most wanted a college education for them, although the way in which college was viewed varied considerably. In some cases it was seen as a concrete reality, while in others it was merely a vague and remote hope. In over half of the families, there was no expectation that college education could actually be realized. Financial limitation was the major obstacle mentioned although doubts about the child's ability and about his interest in college were expressed many times.

Generally, the parents who had previously communicated to the counselors that they could not come to school did so as a result of practical limitations, while the parents who had not replied to invitations to meet with the counselors were further deterred by additional feelings about the interview. Some of this latter group of parents felt that if their child was not in trouble there was no need to go to school, while others felt apprehensive about going to school because of inability to speak English. In comparison with this group, the parents who had originally communicated with the counselors were generally from a higher occupational and educational background, had higher aspirations for their children, more frequently expected their children to attain these goals, and were more aware of educational and career opportunities.

This special study accomplished its major objectives of establishing contact with the "hard-to-reach" parents, learning more about the families' aspirations and discovering why the parents were difficult to involve in the project. A very rich picture of the reality in which the children lived and a dynamic view of the family interaction resulted from the home visits. Even if the interview had accomplished nothing further than providing the parent with some bit of knowledge which was important in planning for the child's future, it would certainly have been judged worth the additional time and effort. These "hard-to-reach" parents were not hard to reach in terms of being inaccessible or resisting. When arrangements were made to visit them at home at hours convenient to them, all were responsive and cooperative.

Results of Project Attempts to Reach and Influence Parents

Over the three year period of the junior high school project, there was a notable change in the extent of participation by parents in project activities. During the first year, counselors had to initiate ten interviews for each one requested by parents. The third year found a complete reversal as ten parents requested interviews for each one initiated by the counselors. Although there was an overall improvement in attendance at daytime and evening group meetings for parents, it was found that on the whole, the majority of parents would make sacrifices to come for an individual interview concerning their child even when they did not come to group meetings.

During Open School Week, each parent had the opportunity to speak with his child's teachers as well as with his guidance counselor at both afternoon and evening sessions set aside for this purpose. Attendance at both sessions showed extraordinary improvement over that of pre-project years. Each evening a number of individual appointments had to be scheduled for a later date to accommodate the parents who were still in the guidance office awaiting interviews when the gong sounded at 9:45 P.M.

CHAPTER V

THE PROJECT PROGRAM IN GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

Guidance

The guidance program, conducted by two trained counselors, provided for intensive work with individual students and guidance in groups. The primary purpose of the program was to stimulate the students and to produce a change in the negative feelings of discouragement and inferiority which many students had about themselves. In all phases of the program, the counselors and teachers recognized the importance of affording the students experiences that brought not only satisfactions to the young people themselves, but also approval of others.

Individual Counseling

The heart of the guidance program in the senior high school was the individual counseling. Since the counselors devoted their entire day to guiding the project students, and since the case load of each averaged approximately one hundred pupils, they were available to the students and teachers whenever they were needed. (Since the junior high school project classes were much larger, the counseling services there could not be as comprehensive.) Before their scheduled interviews with the boys and girls, the counselor had available for review considerable pertinent information: records of attendance, health and achievement; test scores; reports from teachers, clinicians and agencies; reports on interviews with parents and records of previous counseling interviews with the students; autobiographies and compositions written by the students. Interviews were unhurried and varied in length from fifteen minutes to an hour depending on the nature of the problem. Some pupils had as many as twenty extended interviews of this type in one term, as well as brief and informal meetings.

Interviews were concerned with the students' programs, educational progress, health problems, emotional needs, post-high school plans, financial worries, difficulties at home, and boy-girl relationships. The majority of the problems handled by the counseling office were the usual ones presented by most adolescents. Others, however, were serious and required immediate action as well as long-range planning. These urgent cases occurred with considerable frequency - often several times a week. The problems were varied: A father reported he had no idea where his son was living although he knew he was attending school; a boy claimed there were so many relatives in his home that he had no place to study or even to sleep; a girl announced she couldn't stand the quarreling going on in her family, had left home, and was leaving school; a boy was to appear in court charged with stealing a pair of shoes; a girl who had unwittingly become involved in a gang incident came in for help. Counseling such students often involved the use of all the resources of the school in addition to many community agencies. The counselors found it necessary to consult with the project psychologist and social worker, the Welfare Division, Housing Authority, Bureau of Attendance, and the City Courts.

In working with the boys and girls, the counselors were especially alert to their health needs. Many of these young people never had adequate medical care. For some, there was a need for nutritious food which the school furnished through free lunches; for others, referrals to hospitals or clinics were necessary for dental care, eye glasses, or treatment for various physical disorders. The counselors made these referrals with the approval of the parents. Students were followed up to ascertain what progress was being made. The hospitals and clinics were contacted to find out if the students referred by the school were reporting regularly and following instructions.

There were many cases where little change could be made in conditions because of chronic illness at home or negative parental attitudes. In some cases, the counselor had to assist the students to develop insight into their problems and to realize that for the present they would have to accept these conditions. As a result of the supportive counseling they received, some of the students succeeded in school in spite of the problems they had to contend with.

As a result of the encouragement and help they received from their counselors, the students came to regard them as friends to whom they could report on activities and accomplishments as well as problems and concerns. Although the counselors established a warm relationship with the students, it was not a sentimental one. They endeavored to have the young people work hard, meet their responsibilities, and seek attainable goals. They planned with them, not for them, and as far as possible, tried to have them make their own decisions.

The counselors furnished the teachers with detailed information about the background and personal needs of the students. They also made available to the teachers data about the potentialities and achievement of the students. In providing the teachers with all this information, the counselors sought neither favors for the students nor lowering of standards. What they did seek was an understanding of the students and patience in dealing with them.

During the term there was a steady flow of information about the students between teachers and counselors. At the end of every term, the teachers furnished the counselors with evaluative reports on the progress of the students, their attitudes and relationships in class, and their academic achievement.

Group Guidance

Group guidance, which was given by the counselors once a week, had many values. It provided opportunities to discuss common problems, to present important information, and to observe student reactions during discussion periods. It helped identify pupils whose attitudes and behavior indicated the need for personal counseling. It was especially important for the students to find other young people with problems similar to theirs. The opportunity was afforded to discuss these problems and to obtain helpful suggestions from the members of the group.

Panel discussions, role playing, and films were utilized in these classes. The use of films dealing with adolescent problems was found to be especially helpful. Students were able to identify with the characters portrayed and project their feelings with less self-consciousness than would otherwise have been possible.

Group guidance in grade 10 (the first senior high school year) focused on orientation to school, the importance of good citizenship, the development of good study habits, and preparation for tests and self-evaluation tasks. In eleventh grade, there was a shift in emphasis to the world of work and planning for college entrance. The last year was concerned with the transition from high school to college and work.

Many guidance lessons were devoted to instructing the students in procedures for filling out the various applications for college admission, scholarships, and College Entrance Examination Board Tests. Parents were also assisted in filling out scholarship application forms.

Trips and Other Guidance Activities

To make their guidance as realistic as possible, the students viewed several films on colleges and also visited some of the four year and two year colleges in the metropolitan area and out-of-town. The students who went on these trips were in the college preparatory program, and before starting out, they were carefully briefed on the entrance requirements of the colleges, their offerings and their facilities.

Selected students of the class of 1960 had the privilege of spending a weekend at Amherst College and at the University of Massachusetts. A comparable group in the class of 1961 spent a weekend at Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges and visited the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The students used the George Washington High School library with its large collection of books on careers and occupations, and had access to the high school's college reading room with its catalogues, brochures, and pamphlets. In addition to the help given by their counselors, the students had the services of the school's two college advisors and the administrative assistant in charge of guidance. They received first hand reports from George Washington graduates on the problems they would face as college students. They also heard guest speakers from many colleges and from industry.

All college applications were accompanied by a letter of explanation concerning the project. In many cases, the applications were supplemented by detailed letters from the principal or administrative assistant in charge of guidance. After the college-bound students graduated from high school, they received a letter from the guidance director of the high school informing them of the services that would be available to help them make an adjustment to college life.

The project students who were going on to work had a special course arranged for them in their senior year. In this course, they received information about local job opportunities, were trained for civil service examinations, and learned how to apply for jobs. At the time of graduation, almost all these students were placed in jobs by the guidance counselors or by the employment counselor from the New York State Employment Service.

Clinical Services

For students who required intensive counseling because of the complexity and severity of their problems, the counselors were able to make referrals to the psychologist and social worker assigned to the school from the Bureau of Child Guidance. Before making referrals to the clinicians, the counselors oriented the students so that they would not be apprehensive about discussing their personal problems.

The two clinicians began their service at the high school in December 1957, and continued until the graduation of the last project in June 1962. Psychiatric service on a consultation basis was also available. When the project was operating both in Junior High School 43 and George Washington High School, the clinicians devoted one day a week to each school. When all the project students were in senior high school, the clinicians spent the two days at George Washington High School. The clinical team worked directly with 20 per cent of the students in the senior high school project program. Many other pupils received help indirectly when the teachers and counselors consulted with the clinical staff.

For most of the cases handled by the clinicians, there was contact with the parents, guardians, or relatives. The social worker had a total of 1000 interviews with her cases and visited many homes. The psychologist had a total of over 800 interviews with his cases. Some of the referrals were handled jointly by the two specialists. The problems handled by the clinicians involved acute emotional disturbances and severe social pathology as well as minor emotional difficulties.

Periodically, the counselors and the clinical team reviewed the progress of all the project students in terms of attendance, academic performance, and behavior to determine if clinical service might be needed. Help on an emergency basis was always available to any student who appeared to be having a difficult time at home or in school. Acceptance by students of the clinical services was facilitated by having the psychologist and social worker right on the premises.

The one common denominator in the entire case load was the broken home. Even where an outwardly normal family structure existed, a closer view revealed a hollowness in the intra-family relationships. The climate of rejection that prevailed in many of the homes explained the poor self-image characteristic of so many of the children; from this stemmed the poor motivation that was such a deterrent to academic progress.

Many of the cases involving severe personality disturbances were referred to hospitals and clinics for care. A few of these were too ill to be contained in school and ultimately dropped out.

About half the students referred to the clinicians benefited considerably from the attention they received. The clinicians were successful in arranging for part-time jobs, in obtaining monetary help, better sleeping arrangements, and places to study. They aided in bringing about improved relationships between parents and children. These adjustments made life bearable and school achievement possible for many boys and girls.

The report of the clinicians states that, "for a great many students, contact with the clinical services brought about a change in attitude toward their personal problems, their school work and their home situations. They were given support and a measure of self-confidence. In the very attention they received, the students and their parents gained a sense of dignity and importance."

Special Instructional and Remedial Program

Students were grouped homogenously in all major subject areas on the basis test data and school records. Almost all of the pupils were kept in the same class with the same teacher for a full year. However, considerable flexibility was permitted, and where it was desirable, pupils were changed from one group to another at mid-year. Thirteen pupils in the 1960 group were selected from various geometry classes to form an honors project class for the second half of the year.

The registers of all project classes were well below average. In English, science, and social studies, registers were generally in the mid-twenties. In language and mathematics classes there were only ten to fifteen students. Because the students needed intensive training in the basic skills of reading and writing, they were programmed in English for a double period daily. At first, this double period was the basis for many pupil complaints; subsequently, the students agreed that it had been of tremendous value to them.

To enable the project students to extend their social contacts, their classes in English and science and their home room classes included an equal number of students of approximately the same potential who had come to George Washington High School from schools other than Junior High School 43, Manhattan.

Students who needed more help than could be given them in their classes were recommended by their subject teachers and counselors for after school tutoring. These students were tutored in small groups of three or four, and occasionally, individually. Students who failed subjects during the year were encouraged to go to summer school to make up their work.

Cultural Enrichment Program

An extensive program of cultural activities was planned in order to extend the backgrounds of the project students and to widen their aesthetic appreciations. The program included visits to museums, libraries, colleges, and industrial plants. It provided for attendance at motion pictures, concerts, the ballet, and the theatre. Participation in the program was voluntary.

Although money was made available to students who could not afford to meet the expenses involved, one of the most remarkable features of the program was that it was largely self-sustaining. Of the $10,000 that was spent, $8,000 came from the student themselves. The most heartening aspect of this is that many students came to feel that this expenditure was worthwhile, and rather than spend a dollar over the weekend at the local movie, they saved to apply it toward performances of lasting value.

The high point of the cultural program for each graduating class was a trip to Washington, D.C. The students were fortunate enough to be granted interviews with Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, a former United States Commissioner of Education, and with the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. They also talked with Senator Jacob Javits of New York, a graduate of George Washington High School. In all these interviews, the young people conducted themselves admirably and won high praise for their intelligent replies to the questions they were asked.

Careful preparation was made for attendance at each of these activities through periods of orientation and follow up. Whenever possible, this was done in the English classes. For example, before the students went to Stratford, they studied the play that was being presented as a class project. Often the music, history, or science departments briefed the students beforehand. As for follow-up, it was found that much of the pleasure, both anticipatory and actual, was destroyed by formal written reports after each trip or activity. Informal discussions of the experience were encouraged instead.

Shaw and O'Neill had meaning for students of high level ability, while for the more limited students, a play like The Miracle Worker was more suitable. Music, however, cut across all ability levels and some of the most faithful followers of the Philharmonic Orchestra came from the lowest ability groups. Some students who never before had been interested in music attended Sunday afternoon concerts of the Philharmonic.

Reaching and Influencing Project Parents

Every effort was made, in the senior high school as well as in the junior high school, to acquaint parents with the objectives of the program and the benefits that would accrue to their children from it. Contacts were often difficult to make, but many parents were reached through letters, visits by the counselors and the social worker, and individual and group meetings at the school.

Where there was a poor response from the parents, attempts were made to reach older brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts, and even neighbors. Parents who were recent arrivals from Puerto Rico and the southern states often lacked an understanding of the social, emotional, and material needs of adolescents. Many were neither aware of nor interested in the educational and cultural opportunities available to their children. Some felt that a girl should not have more than elementary schooling.

The attempt was made to influence parents in such matters as reasonable assignments of home chores and a place for study and homework. Parents were given information about the organization and activities of the school. In some instances, parents were encouraged to promote the emotional growth of their children by a more permissive attitude, and by allowing them to express their opinions in the discussion of family problems. At times, it was suggested that parents give up the small earnings of the child from an after-school job so that he might spend more time studying and preparing himself for a career. Occasionally, parents felt that the project personnel were siding with the child against the parents. When a parent was inflexible, an attempt was made to build the child's inner strength to adjust to the situation.

PART III

FINDINGS

CHAPTER VI

MEASUREMENT OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE, AND ATTITUDES OF PROJECT STUDENTS

The first section of this chapter will discuss the growth of the project students both in academic subject matter and in scholastic aptitude. The academic areas investigated include reading, mathematics, and overall school grades. The tests used for academic evaluation were: Stanford Reading Test, Forms J, K, and L; Stanford Arithmetic Test, Form JM; Seattle Algebra Test, First Half. The measures of scholastic aptitude were derived from the results of the following tests: Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test, Beta; Pintner General Ability Test, Verbal Series; Preliminary Scholastic Ability Test - Verbal.

The second section of this chapter deals with attitudes of acceptance among project and nonproject students. A sociometric rating scale based on the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale was administered to the project students in order to measure these attitudes.

A. Changes in Academic Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude

Growth in Reading for Junior High School Students

In order to obtain an assessment of the growth in reading achievement made by project students at Junior High School 43, a summary will be presented of the reading achievement test results of those students in the third project group who were tested in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. The third project group can most effectively be used to explore the effects of the Demonstration Guidance Project, since it was this group which spent the most time in the project and started at the earliest age.[1]

---

[1] When the project began in September 1956, the first project group was in grade 9, graduating from grade 12 in 1960, after four years in the project. The second project group was in grade 8 graduating therefore, from grade 12 in 1961, after five years in the project. The third project group, which was in grade 7, graduated from grade 12 in 1962 after six years in the project.

In October 1956, when the study began, the Stanford Reading Test, Form JM,[2] was administered to the third project group which was then in the seventh grade. Fourteen school months later, in February 1958, Form J of the same test was administered to these students in the eighth grade. In April 1959, the paragraph meaning section of the Stanford Reading Test, Form JM, was administered to these students in the ninth grade. There were 147 students (68 boys and 79 girls) in the third project group who were present for all three tests.[3]

Because the average age of New York City school children in each grade is younger than the national norms, it was necessary to obtain an adjusted school grade so that the New York City school children could be fairly evaluated on nationally standardized tests. In October 1956, the adjusted school grade was 6.8 for the third project group. The median student had a verbal IQ (Otis Beta) of 94.9, a nonverbal IQ (SRA) of 105.9, and a paragraph reading grade equivalent score (Stanford-JM) of 5.4. Approximately 11 per cent of the group had scores one year or more above adjusted grade level, while 53 per cent had scores more than 1.3 years below adjusted grade level, and approximately 10 per cent had scores more than 3.3 years below.

Table 12 presents the distribution of scores made by these students as they progressed from the seventh to the eighth and ninth grades.

---

[2] Form JM is the same as form J, but is adapted for machine scoring.

[3] An additional testing for these children took place in February 1959. A discussion of the reasons why these test results are not included in the comparison is presented on page 69 of this chapter.

TABLE 12

Comparison of Median Grade Equivalent Scores on the Paragraph Meaning Section of the Stanford Reading Test, Form JM by 147 Students In the Third Project Group

Grade Equivalent	October 1956	February 1959	April 1959
12.0 - 12.9	-	2	15
11.0 - 11.9	-	8	21
10.0 - 10.0	1	15	31
9.0 - 9.9	1	13	23
8.0 - 8.9	11	24	28
7.0 - 7.9	13	23	13
6.0 - 6.9	32	31	9
5.0 - 5.9	26	19	5
4.9 - 4.9	36	10	5
3.0 - 3.9	17	2	-
Below 3.0	10	-	-
Median	5.4	7.5	9.7
Adjusted school grade	6.8	8.2	9.4

Table 12 reveals that the median student was retarded 1.4 years in October 1956, 7 months in February 1958, and was 3 months above grade level in April 1959. The median student showed a growth of 4.3 years in the 2.6 school years that elapsed between the administration of the first and third test. In the first 14 months, the gain was 21 months, and in the second 12 months, the gain was 22 months.

Eleven per cent of the students were one year or more above the adjusted grade expectancy (6.8) in paragraph meaning at the time of the first test. For the second test, 25 per cent were one year or above grade expectancy (8.2), and for the third test, 35 per cent were at least one year above expectancy (9.4). In actual number of students, this means that 16 students were at least one year above expectancy in October 1956, 37 students in February 1958, and 54 students in April 1959.

Eighty per cent of the group (117 students) were below grade expectancy on the first test, 63 per cent (92 students) were below expectancy on the second test, and 46 per cent (68 students) were below expectancy on the third test. In October 1956, approximately one student out of ten had paragraph reading grade equivalent scores more than 3.3 years below the adjusted school grade equivalent score. In February 1958, the ratio became one student out of fifteen, and in April 1959, it became one student out of eighteen.

Sex Differences in Reading Achievement

Table 13 presents the differences between boys and girls in reading achievement test scores.

TABLE 13

Comparison of Median Grade Equivalent Scores Made by 68 Boys and 79 Girls In the Third Project Group on the Paragraph Meaning Section Of the Stanford Test, Form JM

Grade Equivalent	October 1956		February 1958		April 1959	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
12.0 - 12.9	0	0	2	0	11	4
11.0 - 11.9	0	0	5	3	13	8
10.0 - 10.9	1	0	9	6	16	15
9.0 - 9.9	1	0	5	8	7	16
8.0 - 8.9	8	3	12	12	9	19
7.0 - 7.9	7	6	8	15	6	7
6.0 - 6.9	9	23	11	20	4	5
5.0 - 5.9	9	17	11	8	2	3
4.0 - 4.9	18	18	4	6	0	2
3.0 - 3.9	10	7	1	1	0	0
Below 3	5	5	0	0	0	0
Median	5.21	5.54	7.89	7.29	10.36	9.20
Adjusted Grade	6.8	6.8	8.2	8.2	9.4	9.4

Generally speaking, the gains made by the boys exceeded those made by the girls. The median boy who had a score of 1.6 years below adjusted grade level in October 1956 was almost one year above adjusted grade level in April 1959. The median girl who had a score of 1.2 years below grade level in October 1956 was two months below grade level in April 1959.

In the seventh grade only 28 per cent of the boys were above grade level while in the ninth grade 66 per cent were above grade level. In the seventh grade, 53 per cent of the boys were more than 1.3 years below adjusted grade level while in the ninth grade only 18 per cent were below. In the seventh grade, 14 per cent of the girls were above grade level while in the ninth grade, 43 per cent were above grade level. In the seventh grade, 53 per cent of the girls were more than 1.3 years below adjusted grade level while in the ninth grade, only 18 per cent were below.

Comparability of Test Forms

The problem of measuring gains on achievement tests is complicated by the fact that results obtained on one test may not be comparable to results on a purportedly equivalent form of the same test. For this reason, the project originally planned to use the same test before and after a period of instruction in order to assess academic achievement. However, in the interest of saving time and avoiding duplication it was thought that when the same or an equivalent form of the test was being used on a citywide basis, the citywide results could be used for evaluation of the project students. Thus, in the junior high school, the initial reading test given by the project was the Stanford, Form JM, in October 1956. The citywide Stanford Test in February 1958 was Form J, and in February 1959, Form L. The results for the total group in 1959 showed average gains which were significantly less than had been found previously. Many children rated lower in 1959 than they had a year earlier.

In view of this, a study of the three forms of the Stanford Reading Achievement Test was undertaken to check on the results of February 1959. Forms J and K were administered in March 1959 to three ninth grade classes, with half of each class taking Form J first and half taking Form K first, to see whether the scores would differ on the three forms. Since large differences were found, Forms J and K were then administered to the remainder of the ninth grade experimental group in April 1959, and the results for the total experimental ninth grade population were analyzed.

These findings showed that scores on Forms J and K were significantly higher than those on Form L.[4] The median on Form K was 0.7 years higher, and the median on Form J was 1.4 years higher than that on Form L for the same students in the one to two months which had elapsed since the administration of Form L. The median on Form J was 0.7 years higher than that on Form K when both were given at the same time. It is evident that these forms are not comparable forms for this population, and these findings point up the need for caution in using different forms in measuring growth in any population.

---

[4] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Research Report No. 27. (Mimeographed)

Growth in Mathematics Achievement

In Junior High School 43, Manhattan, the Stanford Arithmetic Test, Form M, was administered in October 1956 and October 1958 to the third project group to measure the growth of students in arithmetic reasoning and arithmetic computation. When these students reached the ninth grade and studied algebra, they were given the Seattle Algebra Test.

Stanford Arithmetic Test

In October 1956 the Stanford Achievement Test, Form JM, in Arithmetic, was administered to the third project group which was then in the seventh grade. The third project group was tested with the same test again in October 1958. Discharges, new admissions, transfers from non-experimental classes, and the transfer of three students to special high schools had caused a considerable turnover so that the 1956 and 1958 populations tested were quite different. Consequently, in order to make a more meaningful comparison of the 1956 and 1958 results, distributions were made of the grade scores received in reasoning and computation by only those students who had taken both series of tests. The comparison of the Median Grade Equivalent Scores is presented in Table 14.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Median Grade Equivalent Scores of Third Project Group On the Stanford Arithmetic Test, Form JM

	No. of Students	Median G.E. Scores October 1956	October 1958	Gain
Arithmetic Reasoning	166	5.7	7.5	1.8
Arithmetic Computation	166	5.7	7.5	1.8

From the data reported in Table 14 it will be observed that between October 1956 and October 1958 the same pupils had a gain of 1.8 school years in arithmetic reasoning. The achieved an equal gain between these dates in arithmetic computation. This gain of 1.8 years over a two year span of time may be considered of normal expectancy for a group of students with an average IQ of 95 on the Otis Beta Mental Ability Test. The final arithmetic test was administered in October 1958 after the 166 students had completed their study of formal arithmetic and had begun their study of algebra. It is possible that some loss in achievement may have occurred because of the summer vacation between June and October when the final test was administered.

Seattle Algebra Test

In order to measure the achievement of the experimental classes taking algebra, the Seattle Algebra Test, First Half, was administered in February 1958 and February 1959 to both the ninth grade and the Special Progress project students.[5] The results are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

Achievement on Seattle Algebra Test, First Half by 401 Ninth Grade Students in the First and Second Project Groups

%ile Range	Regular Experimental Students		SP Students	
	February 1958 N = 172	February 1959 N = 180	February 1958 N = 25	February 1959 N = 24
90 - 99	2	15	5	8
80 - 89	11	13	5	5
70 - 79	11	8	3	2
60 - 69	9	13	7	2
50 - 59	7	6	1	3
40 - 49	12	23	1	3
30 - 39	21	26	3	1
20 - 29	14	11	-	-
10 - 19	37	34	-	-
1 - 9	44	28	-	-
1 -	4	3	-	-
Median	20%ile	34.9%ile	69.75%ile	81.5%ile

The median score in February 1958 for the regular experimental students was at the 20th percentile. In February 1959 it was at the 35th percentile, indicating that the second group had achieved 15 percentile points higher. This group had the benefit of instruction by means of split half classes. The median score for the SP student group in February 1958 was at the 69.75 percentile. In February 1959 it was at the 81.5 percentile showing a gain of 12 percentile points for the 1959 SP group compared with the 1958 SP group. These higher median percentiles for SP students are to be expected because the SP pupils were selected from among those pupils who had IQs of 125 to 130 or higher and had achieved high scores on reading and arithmetic tests.

---

[5] The Special Progress students are given an accelerated program which allows them to complete the three junior high school years in two years.

Geometry

In scholastic averages for geometry the students made a very favorable showing considering their level of scholastic aptitude when they entered George Washington High School. Table 16 indicates the range as well as the median achievement as judged by the teachers' ratings or marks.

TABLE 16

End of Term Marks, June 1958, in Geometry for 79 Project Students Registered in Course at George Washington High School

End Term Marks	No. of Students
95 - 99	1
90 - 94	4
85 - 89	7
80 - 84	16
75 - 79	12
70 - 74	12
65 - 69	19
60 - 64	0
55 - 59	3
Below 55	5
Total	79

Median End Term Mark = 75

The mathematics classes of not more than fifteen project students allowed for more individualization of instruction. This is reflected by the fact that median mark, or grade, was 75. The range of marks was from below 55 to 96. One student achieved a mark of 96; four achieved 90-94; seven, 85-89; sixteen, 80-84; and twelve, 75-79. For these pupils, the achievement in mathematics must be considered as very successful.

Scholastic Averages of Project Students

Average class marks in major subjects and relative standing in the graduating class are among factors which must be considered in deciding whether a student is to be admitted into college. Table 17 presents data for the 329 senior high school project students who remained at George Washington High School to the end of grade 12. The tabulation includes separate data for (1) the academic diploma graduates, who completed the college preparatory course successfully; (2) the general and commercial diploma graduates, who started senior high school in the academic course, but then transferred; (3) the few students in the third project group who were still in senior high school in February 1963; (4) the dropouts. Since there are only minor variations among the three project groups they are not presented separately.

TABLE 17

Average in Major Subjects of 329
George Washington High School Project Entrants

Average in Major Subjects	Graduates Academic Diploma	Other Diploma (a)	Still in H.S. 2/63	Dropouts	Total
95-99	2	-	-	-	2
90-94	6	-	-	-	6
85-89	16	1	-	-	17
80-89	27	2	-	5	34
75-79	36	23(1)	-	4	63(1)
70-74	17	72(3)	-	12	101(3)
65-69	4	43(2)	-	25(5)	72(7)
60-64	-	6(1)	2	12(4)	20(5)
55-59	-	-	2	6(2)	8(2)
Below 55	-	-	-	6(4)	6(4)
Total	108	147(7)	4	70(15)	329(22)

(a) There were 3 commercial diplomas; the other 144 were general diplomas.

Note:

The numbers in parenthesis indicate the students who were shifted to nonproject classes because of difficulties they were having in project classes. These students are included in the tabulation since they were project entrants who remained at George Washington High School.

The averages are for ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades for the graduates and for the students who dropped out after the eleventh grade. For the 31 students who dropped out before the eleventh grade, the averages cover each student up to the time he left school.

The averages ranged from below 55 to a high of 95.32. This latter average was obtained by a student in the first project class and was the top ranking average in the total class of 909 George Washington High School graduates. Among those who obtained the very low failing averages were some severely disturbed and truanting students.

The median averages were 79.1 for the academic graduates, 71.2 for the general diploma graduates, and 66.7 for the dropouts. For the total group the median average was 72.4.

Eight students, all academic course graduates, obtained averages of 90 or higher and were among the top ranking students in the school. None of the students at George Washington High School who had come from Junior High School 43 in the three preceding years had averages of 90 or over; the highest was 87.32. Forty-nine students, approximately one in every five project students, had an average of at least 80. Nearly half of the academic graduates had averages of at least 80.

Altogether, 295 of the 329 project students earned averages of at least 65 per cent, indicating that when the students who found the college preparatory program too difficult were placed in the less demanding curriculum, approximately nine out of every ten project students were able to maintain at least a passing average, even if they did not pass all subjects.

Six academic graduates ranked in the top one per cent of the total George Washington High School graduating classes in the three years. There were also two other students who had averages of above 90. The IQ results for these eight students on the Pintner Intermediate Test which was given in the eighth grade were not unusually high. Only one student had an IQ above 130 on that test; the other IQs ranged from 95 to 128.

The final educational success of the students as measured by the numbers who succeeded in graduating from high school, earning academic diplomas, and going on to college or other types of schools is discussed in Chapter VIII.

Changes in Scholastic Aptitude

Several studies were conducted to determine whether or not the enrichment and remedial programs influenced measures of scholastic aptitude, known also as measures of intelligence. The research staff used the following verbal tests of intelligence to indicate whether there were changes in project students:

I. Otis Beta Mental Ability Test — given as part of the citywide testing program in the sixth grade, and repeated in the ninth grade for project students.

II. Pintner General Ability Test, Verbal Series — Intermediate Test, Form B, given in the eighth grade to the first and third project groups and in the ninth grade to twelve SP students in the second project group; Advanced Test, Form B, given to these same students in the eleventh grade; Intermediate Test, Form A, given in the eighth grade to the second project group and in the ninth grade to eleven SP students in the third project group; Advanced Test, Form A, given to these same students in the eleventh grade.

There are theoretical differences among psychologists in computing the ratio IQ. Increases in raw score on IQ tests lessen starting at chronological age 15 and almost cease at chronological age 17. For this project, when the chronological age of 15 was used in computing the ratio IQ, appreciable gains in the IQ were discovered for the project students. When an age of 16 or 17 was used as denominator in computing the ratio IQ, no appreciable gains were noted.

Summary

The data available show that the special instructional program of the Demonstration Guidance Project resulted in positive gains by project students in the area of academic achievement. The greatest improvement was noted in reading. Reading had been given the most attention by project personnel when they set up the regular and remedial instructional programs. In arithmetic the gains were considered adequate in terms of the normal expectancy for the group. The scholastic averages of the project students were considered very favorable particularly when they were compared by the teaching staff with the scholastic averages of similar pupils in this school before the project was initiated.[6]

---

[6] Further details on senior high school scholastic averages may be found in Henry T. Hillson and Florence C. Myers, The Demonstration Guidance Project, 1957-1962. (New York City: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1963), pp. 18-20.

B. Social Acceptance in George Washington High School

The project students in George Washington High School were grouped, in some classes, with an equal number of nonproject students. This was done in order to widen the social contacts of the project students. Each of the mixed classes contained nonproject students who matched the project students in academic potential but who came from different junior high schools and neighborhoods, and were of different ethnic and cultural background.

The project staff wished to determine the extent to which the project students accepted each other and were accepted by their nonproject classmates. It was felt that this would indicate degree of effectiveness of the guidance program in the area of social relations. The research staff devised a sociometric rating scale, "Picking Friends" which was based on the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale.

The rating scale was administered to both project and nonproject students in each of the mixed classes at the completion of their first year in senior high school. Each student was provided with a mimeographed list of his classmates. He was asked to rate each of his classmates on a five point scale: (1) very, very best friends; (2) good friends; (3) not friends, but OK; (4) you don't know them; (5) you know them, but they are not friends and are not OK to you. Students were told that their ratings would not be revealed to their classmates.

In addition to rating his classmates, each student was required to provide a self-rating. He was asked to rate himself on the same five point scale to indicate how he thought the whole class regarded him.

Results

In general, it was found that there was positive peer acceptance both within and between project and nonproject groups of students. In addition, ratings were compared to see if there were differences between the project and nonproject groups in the extent of inter- and intra-group acceptance. No significant differences were found between:

1. nonproject students' acceptance of project students and nonproject students' acceptance of each other.

2. project students' acceptance of nonproject students and nonproject students' acceptance of each other.

3. nonproject students' acceptance of project students and project students' acceptance of nonproject students.

The results did indicate that there was a greater degree of in-group acceptance in the experimental population. The project students accepted one another to a significantly greater extent:

1. than non-project students accepted each other.
2. than project students accepted nonproject students.
3. than nonproject students accepted project students.

Both project and nonproject students produced self-ratings which indicated positive self-acceptance with no significant differences between project and nonproject students.

Conclusions

There was positive peer acceptance in the project and nonproject populations. The students revealed that they established good social relationships with their classmates and therefore, it may be presumed that they felt personally secure in their surroundings. Evidence was found that there existed a significant degree of in-group acceptance in the experimental population which was probably brought about by a longer period of social contact among project students.

CHAPTER VII

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND PLANS

Questionnaires to elicit information about educational and vocational aspirations were completed by all project students several times during the course of the project. The questionnaire responses indicate what the students' aspirations were or what they thought they should say their aspirations were. In pre-adolescence the fantasy level is still common in occupational choice and many students were probably at that stage when the initial questionnaire was given in junior high school. However, it was expected that as the students grew older and were exposed to a wide variety of experiences, they would better be able to appraise their own abilities and interests so that they could begin to make more realistic educational and vocational choices.

Initial information about aspirations was obtained for all students in Junior High School 43, both experimental and non-experimental, in January, 1957.[1] A questionnaire, "About Me and My Plans" was developed and administered by the project research staff.

The questionnaire was given two more times when project students reached the end of their tenth grade, and again when they reached the end of twelfth grade. Thus, for the first administration, all students were in the first year of the project and were spread out in grades 7, 8, and 9. However, for the second and third administrations, students had completed varying amounts of time in the project. For example, the test was given to each project group at the end of grade 10 and so the first project group had completed two years in the project, the second had completed three years and the third had completed four years.

Educational Aspirations

Table 18 presents the results for the project students on those portions of the questionnaire dealing with the students' educational aspirations.

---

[1] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Project Report No. 12. (Mimeographed) Also, see Appendix A.

TABLE 18

Expressed Educational Aspirations of Project Students as Elicited by the Questionnaire "About Me and My Plans"

Date	Total No. Students	College	Other Post-High School	High School Grad. Only
Jan. 1957[a]	707	70.9%	15.3%	13.4%
End Grade 10[b]	335	71.3%	16.4%	9.9%
End Grade 12[b]	222	79.3%	14.4%	6.3%

[a] These students were spread out in grades 7, 8, and 9 since they were all tested on the same date. The first testing was for junior high school project students. The two subsequent testings were done in senior high school, after the project group had been considerably reduced in size.

[b] The questionnaire used in 1957 was slightly revised for the grades 10 and 12 testings so that it would be more applicable to high school students.

The vast majority of the students in the program expressed high educational aspirations from the time of the first testing and continued to do so throughout the project years. The percentage of students expressing a desire to go to college at the end of grade ten was only negligibly higher than the percentage with a similar desire at the time of the January 1957 administration of the questionnaire. Only eight per cent more of the project students expressed a desire to go to college at the end of grade twelve. Thus it might seem that the project did not influence educational aspirations. However, "About Me and My Plans" was administered in January 1957 after the final reorganization for the project which took place in December 1956. This was five months after the inception of the project in September 1956 and there had already been much activity in the school and the surrounding community which would most likely have sparked new hopes and so influenced the questionnaire responses even this early in the project.

In September 1956, three full time counselors were assigned to the junior high school in addition to the regular school counselor who was to serve as project coordinator. The bulk of the project students had been selected by the beginning of the school year and so the counselors were able to initiate intensive guidance programs for these students from the beginning. The research personnel, however, were not able to devise and administer the questionnaire until January, after they had completed the task of testing and gathering ratings for the entire junior high school population so that all additional potentially able students could be included in the project. Thus the majority of the project students had already had five months of the guidance program which was described in detail in Chapter IV. This included weekly group guidance classes with stress on career and higher education information. Approximately one assembly program a month was devoted to some aspect of guidance. There were speakers from colleges, nursing schools, and industrial concerns, as well as former graduates from Junior High School 43. In addition, the students had taken trips to high schools, neighboring hospitals, and industrial concerns as part of the guidance program.

At the first Parents' Association meeting of the 1956-57 school year, the principal of Junior High School 43 described in detail the aims and objectives of the project. In October a series of afternoon parents' meetings was initiated. Evening meetings were later held for those unable to attend in the afternoon. The principal, assistant-to-principal, coordinator, and guidance personnel spoke on the objectives of the project, the responsibilities of the school and the parents in accomplishing these objectives, the special remedial and guidance services offered, and the need for cooperation between parents and school. Parents were asked to indicate whether or not they were interested in attending a series of workshops devoted to the topic, "Careers for our Children." All parents were continuously informed by letters in both English and Spanish of the various activities being offered to their children. Many individual contacts were made in person or by telephone to acquaint parents with the purposes of the project.

Table 19 presents a further breakdown by sex of project students aspiring to post-high school education.

TABLE 19

Comparison of Boys and Girls on Types of Post-High School Education Desired

Date	College		Other Post-High School[a]	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Jan. 1957	74.5%	67.8%	10.6%	19.2%
End grade 10	75.5%	67.9%	9.9%	21.7%
End grade 12	82.7%	77.1%	9.2%	17.8%

(a) Special business or nursing schools.

For all three testings, a larger proportion of boys than of girls indicated that they would like to go to college and proportionately more girls than boys wanted to go to other schools.

The students were asked in their first questionnaire to check the level of education that they thought their parents would like them to attain. In all three testings, according to the students, the parents' educational hopes for both the boys and the girls were even higher than the students' aspirations. This was corroborated by the parents themselves in their own responses to questionnaires sent out to them to determine what were their educational aspirations for their children.

Comparison of Aspirations and Plans of Project Seniors and a National Sample of High Aptitude Seniors

The aspirations of the grade 12 project students were compared with those of a national sample of high-aptitude high school seniors who had scored in the top 30 per cent on a brief academic aptitude test administered by the Educational Testing Service. A total of 259 project students (107 boys, 152 girls) were given the same questionnaire ("Questions About You and Your Plans") as had been used in the national study of the factors affecting the future college plans of high school students in 1955.[2] Both the project and national proportions concern the students' expressed interests and expectations and consequently are likely to be larger than the proportions who actually attain these goals.

---

[2] Stice, Glen, Mollenkopf, William G., Torgerson, Warren S., Background Factors and College-Going Plans Among High-Aptitude Public High School Seniors. A study supported by a Grant from National Science Foundation. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, August, 1956.

Table 20 presents a summary of the educational aspirations and plans for the boys and girls in both the project and the national high level ability groups.

TABLE 20

Comparison of Project and National High Ability Students
On Educational Aspirations and Plans

Goal	Project Boys	National Boys	Project Girls	National Girls
Some type of post-high school				
Would like to attend	88%	84%	93%	78%
Expect to attend	87%	82%	89%	69%
College				
Would like to attend	85%	79%	80%	69%
Expect to attend	80%	78%	78%	62%
Trade or Other schools				
Would like to attend	4%	5%	13%	9%
Expect to attend	7%	4%	11%	7%
Expect to work before or while attending college	44%	31%	38%	20%

The proportions of project students with high aspirations and expectations were similar, and in many instances, higher, than those of the high ability national seniors. The differences between the project and national groups were most marked for the girls; in some categories the project girls' aspirations were considerably higher than those of the girls in the national sample.

Career Aspirations

On the questionnaire, the item to elicit career aspirations stated, "Think about what you would like to be 15 years from now. Suppose that with hard work you would be successful in whatever you choose."Table 21 shows a summary of the responses to this item by project and national group students.

TABLE 21

Comparison of Project and National High Ability Students on Career Aspirations

Career Goal	Project Boys	National Boys	Project Girls	National Girls
Professions	67%	63%	57%	44%
Technical	5%	5%	6%	15%
Business & Commercial	15%	14%	27%	23%
Total	87%	82%	90%	82%

Again, as with educational aspirations, the project students are very similar to the national high ability students. The most popular single profession for project boys was accounting while for the national group of boys engineering was the most popular. Education and nursing were equal in first choice popularity for the project girls; education was most popular for the national girls.

Student Goals and Fathers' Status

The students expected to reach higher educational and occupational levels than their fathers. This gap between the generations was even greater for the project group than for the national group since proportionately fewer of the project fathers than of the national fathers had been to college and were in the higher occupational categories.

The proportion of project boys who expected to go to college was approximately six times as great as the proportion of their fathers who had some college education; in the national sample the proportion of boys was only three times as great. The proportion of project girls who expected to go to college was nearly five times as great as the proportion of their fathers who had some college education; in the national sample the proportion of girls was only two and one-half times as great.

There was an especially sharp divergence between the proportions of students with professional aspirations and the proportions of fathers engaged in professions. Among the project students 68 per cent of the boys and 57 per cent of the girls chose professions while 2 per cent of the project boys' fathers and 4 per cent of the project girls' fathers were reported to be in professions. Among the national students, 63 per cent of the boys and 44 per cent of the girls chose professions while 11 per cent of the boys' and 9 per cent of the girls' fathers were reported to be in professions.

Summary

The expressed educational and vocational aspirations of the project students were very high. They equalled, and in several categories, surpassed, the aspirations of a national sample of high ability students. These results are particularly important in view of the stress placed by the Commission on Integration on the need for raising the educational and vocational sights of able students from disadvantaged areas. On the basis of the findings reported in this chapter, an intensive and comprehensive program can be most effective in sparking educational and vocational dreams. What is crucial is that much time and effort be spent to develop means by which these dreams may be translated into strongly motivated and realistic goals.

CHAPTER VIII

FINAL EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF PROJECT STUDENTS

One of the methods by which the effectiveness of the project may be determined is through an examination of the final educational status of the project students. This chapter is divided into two sections: the first discusses in detail high school graduation and post-high school attendance by project students; the second section compares the entire student body of the junior high school (both project and nonproject groups) during the project years with the total junior high school population during the three years immediately preceding the project.

The data presented are complete as of February 1963. A few students from the third class who failed to graduate with their class at the expected date in June 1962 were still in high school in February 1963, and were planning to graduate that June. Furthermore, the figures on senior high school graduates and post-high school entrants include only those verified by the schools. In addition, student replies to questionnaires indicated that some dropouts, particularly those in the armed forces, may have obtained high school diplomas subsequently and some additional students may have entered college or other schools. However, the student statements were not considered in the statistics unless verification had been received from the schools. Thus, the percentages reported in this chapter for senior high school graduation and attendance at post-high school institutions are conservative.

I. HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AND POST-HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

There were 379 admissions to project classes at George Washington High School. Of these, 14 did not enter the senior high school, and 36 entered, but subsequently transferred to other schools. In this section, the data on George Washington High School project students are for the 329 remaining students. Data are also presented for 210 students who could be traced from the group of 227 students who were in the junior high school project group but did not enter project classes in the senior high school.

A. George Washington High School Project Students

The final senior high school project group of 329 students includes the 307 students who remained in project classes throughout their senior high school years and the 22 students who started out with the project, but were later shifted to nonproject classes in the school because they were having difficulty. Most of this latter group of students continued to receive project services.

Final High School Status

The data on final high school status and type of diploma for project boys and girls are summarized in Table 22.

TABLE 22

Final High School Outcomes for 329 George Washington High School Project Entrants from Junior High School 43 Manhattan who Remained In George Washington High School[a]

	Boys(N=144)		Girls(N=185)		Total(N=329)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Diploma						
Academic	49	34.0	59	31.9	108	32.8
General	51	35.4	93	50.3	144	43.8
Commercial	2	1.4	1	0.5	3	0.9
Total Graduated[b]	102	70.8	153	82.7	255	77.5
Still in H.S.2/63	3	2.1	1	0.5	4	1.2
H.S. Dropouts	39	27.1	31	16.8	70	21.3

(a)Included here are the 22 students who were shifted from project to nonproject classes.

(b)Data were compiled as of June 1961 for the first class, June 1962 for the second class, February 1963 for the third class; this was one year after expected date of graduation in the first two classes and one half year after expected date of graduation in the third class.

The percentages of project boys and girls who received academic diplomas were fairly similar. However, a larger percentage of the project girls than of the project boys graduated because proportionately more of the girls than of the boys remained to complete high school with a general diploma.

Of the total group of 329 project entrants who stayed at George Washington High School, 21.3 per cent left school without graduating; of these, 8.5 per cent in their third year (which should have been their graduating year), and 4.6 per cent left after their third year. Thus, more than half of the dropouts remained in senior high school for at least two years, with 15, or more than a fifth of them staying through or beyond the graduating date for their classes.

Post-High School Education

Slightly more than half of the 329 project entrants entered some type of school beyond high school. An additional 14.1 per cent of the graduates applied for admission, but either did not enter or their attendance could not be verified. Among the academic graduates, 89 per cent continued schooling.

Only those students whose attendance was verified are included in Table 23 which presents a summary of the data on the post-high school education of the project students.

TABLE 23

Type of Post-High School Education for George Washington High School Project Students

	Boys(N=144)		Girls(N=185)		Total(N=329)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Four Year College						
full-time	26	18.1	34	18.4	60	18.2
part-time	9	5.6	8	4.3	16	4.9
Two Year College						
full-time	14	9.7	22	11.9	26	10.9
part-time	18	12.5	16	8.6	34	10.3
Special School[(a)]						
full-time	1	0.7	9	4.9	10	3.0
part-time	2	1.4	11	5.4	15	3.6
All Schools						
full-time	41	28.5	65	35.1	106	32.2
part-time	31	19.4	35	18.4	65	18.8
Total	72	47.9	100	53.5	171	51.0

(a) Business schools, mechanical institutes, beauty culture schools, and hospital nursing schools.

The largest single number of high school project students, 60, went to four year day colleges. Altogether, however, less than half of the high school project students who continued their schooling enrolled in four year colleges, day or evening. Most of the students who entered four year colleges enrolled in full-time programs; 60 students, 18.2 per cent of the total senior high school project group, entered full-time programs and 16 entered on a part-time basis. In the third class, all but one student of those enrolled in four year colleges attended full-time.

Among those who entered two year colleges the numbers of full-time and part-time students were nearly the same; 36 students registered in day sessions and 34 in evening programs.

Fairly similar percentages of boys and girls entered four year and two year colleges. However, since there were fewer boys than girls who graduated, proportionately more of the boy graduates (64.7%) than of the girl graduates (52.3%) attended college.

Proportionately more girls than boys went on to special schools and this difference held for both the total group (2.1% boys, 10.3% girls) and for the graduates (1.0% boys, 11.8% girls). This resulted in a larger total percentage of the girls than of the boys in post-high school education.

B. Junior High School Project Students Who Were Not in the George Washington High School Project at Any Time

From the total junior high school group of 720 students, 592 were rated by the junior high school as being of experimental caliber. However, in a second evaluation by George Washington High School, 249 of these 592 students either were judged not to have sufficient academic potential to continue in the senior high school project program or had been admitted to special academic high schools in the city. In addition, the families of 14 of the students slated to enter senior high school project classes moved to other parts of the city or out-of-town. These 263 students, then, did not come at all into contact with the senior high school project.

It was possible to obtain information about 210 of the 263 students. There were 38 of these 210 who had passed the entrance examination and been admitted to the special academic high schools—Bronx High School of Science, Brooklyn Technical High School, Stuyvesant High School, High School of Music and Art, and High School of Performing Arts. Since these were an especially select group, the findings for them are given separately as well as combined with those for the other students.

Final High School Status

Table 24 presents the data for the junior high school project students who were (1) in special academic high schools or (2) in other nonproject classes either in George Washington High School or in other city or out-of-town high schools.

TABLE 24

Final High School Status of Junior High School Experimental Students Who Did Not Enter the High School Project

	Special Academic H. S. Students (N=38)		Other Nonproject Class Students (N=172)		TOTAL (N=210)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic Diplomas	30	78.9	16	9.3	46	21.9
Other Diplomas	5	13.2	85	49.4	90	42.9
Total Completed H.S.	35	92.1	101	58.7	136	64.8
Still in H.S. 2/63	1	2.6	3	1.7	4	1.9
H. S. Dropouts	2	5.3	68	39.5	70	33.3
Status not known	1	-	16	-	17	-

As might be expected, there were sharp differences between the highly selected special high school students and the other students not only in the incidence of academic diplomas but also in total graduation and dropout rates.

The only significant difference between the boys and girls favors the boys and is due to the larger number of boys (31) than girls (7) in the select examination high schools. A total of 30 boys and 16 girls obtained academic diplomas. These included 24 of the 34 select boys and 6 of the 7 select girls.

Post-High School Education

A total of 69 students, approximately 32.8 per cent of the 210 students, attended some type of school after high school. Among the 46 students with academic diplomas, 40, or 87 per cent were continuing in higher education as of February 1963. Table 25 presents a breakdown of the type of school entered by the 69 students.

TABLE 25

Type of Post-High School Education for Junior High School Experimental Students Who Did Not Enter the High School Project

	Special Academic H. S. Students (N=38)		Other Nonproject Class Students (N=172)		TOTAL (N=210)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Four Year College						
full-time	23	60.5	15	8.7	38	18.1
part-time	3	7.9	3	1.7	6	2.9
Two Year College						
full-time	2	5.3	6	3.5	8	3.8
part-time	1	2.6	7	4.1	8	3.8
Special Schools						
full-time	-	-	4	2.3	4	1.9
part-time	-	-	5	2.9	5	2.4
All Schools						
full-time	25	65.8	25	14.5	50	23.8
part-time	4	10.5	15	8.7	19	9.0
Total	29	76.3	40	23.2	69	32.8

The 69 students who pursued further education included 29 of the group who had been in the special academic high schools, most of whom entered four year colleges. Proportionately more of these special high school students than of the rest of the students, most of whom were academically much less able, continued their education and went to four year colleges. Slightly more than three-fourths of these students (75.3%) and nearly one-fourth of the other students (23.2%) obtained some type of post-high school education.

Fourty-four students, 21.0 per cent of the total group of 210, entered four year colleges. Twenty-six of these were the special high school students (68.4% of the 38 students) and eighteen were from the rest of the group ((10.5% of the 172 students). Most of them entered full-time programs; 38 or 18.1 per cent of the total group with 23 or 60.5 per cent of the special students and 15 or 8.7 per cent of the other students.

In the total group of students who were not in the high school project proportionately more boys than girls went on to four year colleges. This difference is due to the larger number of boys than girls in the special academic high schools. From the group of 106 boys, 20 of the

25 boys who went full-time to four year colleges, were from the select academic schools. (There were 31 boys in these special high schools from the junior high school project.) From the group of 104 girls, 3 of the 13 girls who went full-time to four year colleges, were from the select academic high schools. (There were only 7 girls in these special high schools from the junior high school project.)

C. Comparison of Entire Junior High School 43 Population During Project Years with Total Population During Three Pre-Project Years

In order to aid in determining the effectiveness of the project the research staff decided to make a comparison of the Junior High School 43 graduating classes of 1957-59 (the three project years) with the graduating classes of 1954-56 (the three years immediately preceding the project. The first group was composed of all the students in the graduating classes of 1957, 1958, and 1959 and so included both the project students and the students who were not selected to take part in the project program.

It was felt that the 1954-56 graduating classes of Junior High School 43 would provide the most valid comparison group to meet the evaluation purposes of the research staff. This was in spite of the fact that certain changes were taking place during these years which might have affected the junior high school classes and influenced their post-high school plans. During the junior high school project years (1956-59) the Morningside Heights housing development brought some additional children from middle-income families into the area. Also, the junior colleges were considerably expanded, so that more places were made available to students who previously might otherwise not have even been considered for admission. However, it also happened that the citywide requirements for the senior high school academic diploma were made more stringent.

It cannot be known to what extent these factors influenced the data on percentage of students graduating, admission to post-high school educational institutions, and type of institution attended. Nonetheless, after a study of other possible comparison groups for the 1957-59 junior high school graduating classes, the research staff concluded that the 1954-56 graduating classes offered the most valid basis for comparison.

The students were followed up after graduation by personal contact and questionnaire in order to determine the incidence of admission to post-high school educational institutions. Further data was obtained from student requests that a high school transcript be sent to an educational institution. In addition, information was gathered by mail from various educational institutions in order to verify statements of students indicating that they were attending or planning to attend these institutions.[1]

---

[1] See Appendix C and Appendix D.

Table 26 presents a summary of the data on the post-high school educational status of the graduating classes during the project and non-project years.

TABLE 26

Educational Status of Entire Junior High School 43 Graduating Classes During Project and Pre-Project Years

Years	Total	Senior H. S. Graduates Entered Post-H.S.Inst.		Senior H. S. Graduates No Post-H.S.Educ.		Dropouts		Status Unknown Out of Town		Status Unknown N. Y. C.	
	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Project (1957-59)[a]	1281	285	22.24	376	29.35	505	39.42	69	5.38	27	2.10
Pre-Project (1954-56)	1392	129	9.26	476	34.19	636	45.68	105	7.54	46	3.30

[a] When the data were collected in 1959-1963 there were 19 students from the 1959 junior high school graduating class who had been held over in senior high school. These students, who represent 1.48 per cent of the total junior high school graduating classes of 1957-59, are not included in the table.

An examination of the data shows that the percentage of junior high school graduates entering post-high school educational institutions was much higher for the classes graduating during project years (22.24) than it was for the classes graduating during the three pre-project years (9.26). The earlier group had a higher percentage of senior high school graduates who did not go on to post-high school educational institutions (34.19) than did the later group (29.35). The earlier group also had a higher percentage of dropouts (45.68) than did the later group (39.42).

Thus, it may be stated that the junior high school classes graduating during the project years had made greater educational progress than had the pre-project graduating classes. Although the factors mentioned previously (changes in school population, enlargement of community colleges) may in part account for the differences, it is most probable that the project program played a significant role.

Table 27 presents a further breakdown of the type of post-high school institutions attended by the students who continued their education after senior high school.

TABLE 27

Type of Post-High School Education for Junior High School 43 Graduating Classes During Project and Pre-Project Years

Years	Total N	Four Year Liberal Arts N	%	Two Year Community Colleges N	%	Special Schools[(a)] N	%
Project (1957-59)	1281	129	10.07	107	8.35	59	4.60
Pre-Project (1954-56)	1392	81	5.81	15	1.07	33	2.37

(a) Business schools, mechanical institutes, beauty culture schools and hospital schools.

The most striking difference between the two groups is shown in the percentage of students attending two year community colleges. The later group of students has almost eight times the percentage students in attendance as the earlier group. This is probably to a large extent a reflection of the continuing expansion of the two year community colleges.

This large difference between the two groups in attendance at community colleges still does not account for the greater number of the later group of students in post-high school educational institutions; the percentage of students in both the four year liberal arts colleges and the special schools is almost twice as high for the later group as for the pre-project group. This can not be accounted for solely by socio-economic changes in school population. It is again highly probable that the project program played an important role in bringing about the higher educational attainment of the 1957-59 junior high school graduating classes.

Summary

This chapter has presented the latest information that is available regarding the final educational status of the 329 students who entered the George Washington High School project classes. Data were also presented for 210 of the junior high school project students who did not enter the senior high school project classes. Follow-up studies were conducted to determine the number and percentage of students receiving diplomas as compared with those who dropped out of school before graduation. The students who graduated were further divided as to type of diplomas awarded (academic, general, or commercial.) In addition, data were obtained regarding type of post-high school education sought by project students.

A comparison was made of the entire Junior High School 43 population during the project years with the students in the Junior High School 43 graduation classes for the three years immediately preceding the project's inception. The junior high school population during the three project years included both the project and the non-project students. Compared with the pre-project students, the students who attended the school during the project years showed an increase in the percentages entering four year colledges and other post-high school institutions.

CHAPTER IX

PREDICTION OF ACADEMIC POTENTIAL

One of the essential objectives of the Demonstration Guidance Project was to refine the methods and techniques for prediction of academic potential. Since the ultimate objective was to increase the percentage of students from low socio-economic backgrounds who enter college or other post-high school institutions, identification of academic potential among students was a first step. Standardized test results are a less reliable guide for this type of student than for the middle and upper income family student and so the original design of the project included as one goal experimentation with a variety of techniques. This chapter discusses the predictive power of the nonverbal (or "culture-fair") tests, group achievement and verbal intelligence tests, rating scales, teacher marks, and counselor judgments used for the selection of project students for the academic diploma course in senior high school. The criteria were:

1. An average of at least 65 per cent in major subjects of the junior high school ninth grade curriculum.
2. An IQ of 90 or above on a standardized verbal test.
3. A nonverbal IQ of 100 or above.
4. A paragraph meaning grade score of at least 7.0.
5. A grade score of at least 6.5 in arithmetic reasoning.
6. Judgments of academic potential by teachers and counselors.

A. Tenth Grade Final Marks

Since the first prediction studies were conducted before the project students had completed high school, early indications of high school success were judged by tenth grade final marks. Correlations were computed between each of eight junior high school predictors and tenth grade final marks in major subjects. This study used the students in the first and second project groups. The correlations appear in Table 28.

TABLE 28

Correlations between Tenth Grade Marks in Major Subjects and Predictive Criteria for Students in the First and Second High School Project Groups[a]

Criterion	First Group r	Second Group r
SRA Non-Verbal IQ	.58	.47
Stanford Paragraph Meaning G.E.	.53	.56
Stanford Arithmetic Reasoning G.E.	.51	.64
Mid-term Average of 5 Majors in Ninth Grade	.56	.53
Pintner Intermediate IQ	.39	.35
Average Teacher Ratings, Grade 8	-	.53
Average Teacher Ratings, Grade 9	-	.60
Counselor Ratings, Grade 9	-	.60

[a] Correlations were made for 82 students in the first project group and 78 in the second group.

Except for the Pintner IQ scores, the other criteria produced correlation coefficients with tenth grade marks which ranged from .47 to .64. These criteria had some usefulness in forecasting tenth grade success although no one criterion had value as a single predictor. It may be concluded that the best prediction may be derived from using several of the measures in combination by means of establishing cut-off points on each. It should be noted that for the second group, the teacher and counselor ratings on a 5 point scale were as useful as any of the other criteria.

B. Rank in Class at Graduation

When the first project group completed senior high school, correlations were computed between several of the predictors and graduation class standing or rank. These results are presented in Table 29.

TABLE 29

Correlations between Class Standing at Graduation from George Washington High School and Six Junior High School Predictors for 85 Students in the First Project Group

	SRA IQ	Stanford PM	Stanford AR	Teacher Ratings	Counselor Ratings	Pintner IQ
Class Rank	.13	.55	.59	.62	.55	.48
SRA Non-Verbal IQ		.26	.35	.18	.27	.31
Paragraph Meaning			.65	.62	.66	.70
Arithmetic Reasoning				.53	.62	.65
Teacher Rating					.70	.57
Counselor Rating						.67

An examination of this table indicates that each of the junior high school predictors, with the exception of SRA IQ, had some predictive value. Once again, no one variable stood above the others as a single reliable predictor of high school success as measured by graduation class standing. The best predictors were the Stanford Arithmetic Reasoning and Paragraph Meaning Tests as well as teacher and counselor ratings. Pintner IQ seemed to have somewhat less value than the others except for the SRA IQ whose value as a predictor of class standing was doubtful.

C. Post-High School Educational Status - I

The predictors were evaluated in terms of their usefulness in forecasting whether or not a student would enter a post-high school educational institution. For this study, each experimental high school student was given a rating on a five-point scale to indicate his post-high school educational status, as follows:

1. Received academic diploma, then went to liberal arts college.
2. Received academic diploma, then went to community college or specialized school.
3. Received non-academic diploma, then went to any type of post-high school educational institution.
4. Received any type of high school diploma, then did not go to any post-high school educational institution.
5. Did not complete high school.

Table 30 presents correlation coefficients between the junior high school predictors and post-high school educational status (according to the scale above).

TABLE 30

Correlations between Post-High School Educational Status and Eight Junior High School Predictors for all Three Groups of Experimental Students From George Washington High School

	First Group		Second Group		Third Group		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	TOTAL
Teacher Ratings (11-56)	.49	.41	.51	.43	.23	.33	.42
Pintner Intermediate IQ	.17	-.24	.05	.41	.19	.46	.19
Stanford Reading Achievement (Paragraph Meaning)	.13	.35	.36	.26	.36	-.01	.24
Stanford Arithmetic Achievement (Arithmetic Reasoning)	.19	.19	.29	.19	.18	-.19	.15
SRA Non-Verbal IQ (Form AH)	-.10	.17	.32	-.13	.11	.07	.10
IPAT Culture-Free IQ(a)	-	-	-	-	-.08	.26	.11
Raven Progressive Matrices Raw Scores(a)	-	-	-	-	-.01	.10	.07

(a)The IPAT Culture-Free IQ Test and the Raven Progressive Matrices were tried out experimentally on the third group only.

A review of Table 30 reveals correlation coefficients that were generally of a lower order than were found in Table 29. Teacher ratings provided the best indication of post-high school success. In this case, the total r was .42 with a range from .23 to .51. In predicting class standing at graduation from high school for the first project group, this variable yielded an r of .62. Teacher ratings, therefore, appears to be an important variable to be included in a group of predictors. However, it is not sufficient to use it as a single predictive criterion because a relatively large number of students who were not highly rated by teachers went on to achieve a high level of high school and post-high school success.

The three nonverbal IQ tests had generally no usefulness in predicting post-high school status. The total r for the SRA Non-Verbal Test was .10 with a range from -.13 to .17. The total r for the IPAT Culture-Free Test was .11 with a range from -.08 to .26. The total r for the Raven Progressive Matrices was .07 with a range from -.01 to .10.

A further examination of Table 30 reveals that the Pintner IQ Test and the Stanford Reading and Arithmetic Tests had minimal value. The total r for the Pintner IQ Test was .19 with a range from -.24 to .41. The total r for the Stanford Reading Achievement Test was .24 with a range from -.01 to .36. The total r for the Stanford Arithmetic Achievement Test was .15 with a range from -.19 to .29.

Thus far, in this analysis of the usefulness of the predictive criteria, it can be observed that a few criteria used in combination provided an estimate of graduation class rank which was significantly better than what would have been expected by chance.

D. Post-High School Educational Status - II

With the exception of teacher ratings, these criteria were not much better than chance in forecasting post-high school educational status. This is probably related to the many factors which are not detected in the predictive instruments and which may have considerable effect on post-high school educational status. For example, economic factors at home may induce a student to seek immediate employment upon completing high school. In addition, colleges adjust admission standards each year according to a changing demand for college entrance.

Despite generally low correlations between the predictive instruments and post-high school status, further insight into the usefulness of the instruments may be obtained by comparing average scores obtained by students who received academic diplomas and went to liberal arts colleges with the scores of students who did not complete high school. Table 31 presents mean scores on each criterion for students who obtained an academic diploma and went on to liberal arts college (Category 1, also referred to as the superior group) and for those who did not complete high school (Category 5).

TABLE 31

Mean Scores on Each Criterion for Project Students in Categories 1 and 5[a]

	Category	First Group boys	First Group girls	Second Group boys	Second Group girls	Third Group boys	Third Group girls	TOTAL
Teacher Ratings(b) (11-56)	1	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.4
	5	2.0	1.5	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.9
Pintner Intermediate IQ	1	96.8	108.2	115.0	110.7	116.4	116.8	109.3
	5	93.5	97.8	91.5	93.0	101.3	95.8	95.3
Stanford Reading Achievement (Paragraph Meaning) Grade Equivalents	1	10.1	9.5	7.7	8.0	7.5	5.9	8.3
	5	9.0	8.9	6.0	7.2	7.1	6.0	7.8
Stanford Arithmetic Achievement (Arithmetic Reasoning) Grade Equivalents	1	9.0	8.2	8.4	7.1	7.4	7.1	8.0
	5	8.0	7.6	7.3	7.1	6.8	6.2	7.3
SRA Non-Verbal IQ	1	110.7	115.1	117.6	108.8	120.3	114.5	114.2
	5	108.7	109.2	95.7	102.2	110.9	112.8	107.6
IPAT Culture-Free IQ(c)	1	-	-	-	-	113.8	121.3	118.2
	5	-	-	-	-	116.0	107.7	111.4
Raven Progressive Matrices Raw Scores(c)	1	-	-	-	-	48.3	45.6	46.7
	5	-	-	-	-	46.4	44.3	45.2

[a] Category 1 students, the superior academic group, received an academic diploma and then went to a liberal arts college. Category 5 students did not complete high school.

(b) Highest rating = 1, lowest = 4.

(c) These tests were not given to the first and second project groups.

An examination of the total mean scores presented in Table 31 indicates that for the three groups of students combined, those who received academic diplomas and went on to liberal arts colleges tended to have higher scores on each predictive criterion than did those students who did not complete high school.

It should be noted that the highest possible teacher rating was "1" and the lowest "4." Thus, the group that went on to liberal arts college, the Category 1 students, achieved an average of 1.4 which was higher than the average rating of 1.9 for the dropouts. There was a great deal of overlap between groups. This is noted in the case of the average teacher ratings for the first group of girls in Category 5 who did not complete high school. Their average (1.5) was higher than the third group of boys in the superior group and was equal to the first group of boys in the superior group.

Pintner Intermediate IQ results were generally higher for the Category 1 students (109.3) than for the Category 5 students (95.3). However, the third group of boys in Category 5 had a higher mean I.Q. (101.3) than the first group of boys in the superior group (96.8)

Scores in reading achievement revealed a high degree of overlap. Category 1 students had an average of 8.3 compared to 7.8 for Category 5 students. However, only the first group of boys and the first group of girls in Category 1 had higher mean results than any portion of the Category 5 group. The first group of boys and the first group of girls in Category 5 had higher mean reading scores than the second and third groups of boys and girls in both categories.

In arithmetic achievement, the superior group had a total mean of 8.0 compared to 7.3 for the Category 5 students. Here too, the overlap was extensive. The first and second group of boys and girls in Category 5 had means which were equal to or better than the means for the second and third groups of girls in the superior categories.

SRA Non-Verbal IQ results were generally higher for the superior group. The total mean for the low group was 107.6. Overlap is evident in the comparison of the means for the first group of boys and the second group of girls in the superior group with the first and third groups of boys and girls in Category 5. In these instances the mean IQs ranged from 108.7 to 112.8.

The IPAT Culture-Free Test was administered experimentally to the third group. Here, the superior category students had a mean of 113.2 and the Category 5 students had 111.4. However, the third group of boys in Category 5 had a higher mean than the third group of boys in the superior group. The total superiority of Category 1 was due to the mean of 121.3 for the third group of girls in this category. The third group of girls in Category 5 had a mean of only 107.7.

The Raven Progressive Matrices was also administered experimentally to the third group. The scores reported are raw scores since adequate norms were not available for this test. The highest raw score attainable on this test is 60. The total mean for the third group in the superior category was 46.7 compared to 45.2 for the Category 5. The third group of boys in Category 5 scored somewhat higher on the average than the third group of girls in the superior group.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In the case of each predictive criterion, there was a tendency for the students who received academic diplomas and went on to liberal arts colleges to score higher on the average than students who did not complete high school. However, because of the overlap found for each of the criteria, it can not be concluded that performance on any one criterion could be used to predict final educational status.

There was some improvement in prediction when the predictive criteria were employed to forecast class standing upon graduation from high school. This was especially true in the case of teacher ratings. This predictive criterion was superior to any of the others in predicting class standing at graduation, although teacher rating was not sufficiently discriminating to warrant its use as the sole predictor.

It seems clear that many factors were involved in achieving academic success and that some of these factors were not detected by the measuring devices employed. It can be concluded that the best procedure for prediction would be achieved through the use of a combination of techniques including: (a) teacher ratings, (b) reading achievement, (c) arithmetic achievement, (d) verbal IQ, and (e) nonverbal IQ. In order to select those students having college potential from among a group of students who are culturally and economically similar to those in this study, it is desirable to exclude only those who score relatively low in all or almost all of the criteria. It is conceivable that one of the instruments may be better able to tap the potential of one student while another of the instruments may be more useful with a second student. In addition, to protect against the possibility of eliminating any student having latent capability, no student should be eliminated if his teachers feel that he has academic potential.

CHAPTER X

STUDENT, PARENT, AND STAFF APPRAISAL OF THE PROJECT

The opinions of the students, parents, and teachers about the effects of the program yielded important information about the impact of the Demonstration Guidance Project. Their opinions were obtained both when the students were at Junior High School 43 and at George Washington High School.[1]

A. Junior High School 43, Manhattan

1. Student Opinions

Student compositions in the first and second years of the project and replies to questionnaires in the second and third years revealed that the students' reactions to the program in the junior high school were generally favorable.

Compositions and Comments in the First and Second Years of the Project: In May 1957, the first class of experimental students who were in the ninth grade wrote their views in response to three questions: (1) Which school activities and services were most helpful to you this year? (2) What else might have been done for you? (3) What else would you like to have done next year to help you in high school? In the following year, the next two classes in the junior high school were asked to write on (1) How has the guidance project helped you this year? and (2) What would you like the project to do for you next year? They were also given an opportunity to make free comments on a questionnaire about the project.[2]

There was an analysis made of the compositions and comments of the students in the second and third junior high school experimental classes during their second year in the project.[3]

---

[1] Opinions about student aspirations were discussed in Chapter VII but are also included in this section to give the overviews of student, parent, and staff reaction.

[2] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Report No. 9. (Mimeographed)

[3] Bureau of Educational Research, Demonstration Guidance Report No. 22. (Mimeographed)

Checklist Replies in the Second and Third Years of the Project: The "Pupil Questionnaire," which was administered to 475 students in the second and third classes in May 1958 in the second year of the program, and again to 229 students in the third class in May 1959 in the third year of the program, included 41 short-answer questions. While these do not cover the entire range of services offered in the guidance program, there were a sufficient number of items to give some indication of the students' reactions to certain significant project objectives.

In summary, an analysis of the compositions and questionnaire responses showed that the students in the junior high school experimental classes viewed the project with approval and appreciated the help it had given them. In their opinion, as noted in all the analyses of their responses and comments, the project had shown success in the major goals of raising educational and career sights, expanding cultural experiences, improving self-appraisal, and providing continuous, readily available counseling service, as well as an increasing scholastic effectiveness, in involving parents and providing special help of various kinds for those who needed it. The project was of value not only to students with good potential but also to those of limited potential who did not finally qualify as experimental class students before going on to high school.

2. Parent Opinions

The parents were polled with a brief questionnaire toward the end of each of the three years of the program in Junior High School 43.[4] The percentage of the experimental students' parents responding rose very slightly each year from 66.3% in May 1957, when all three classes were in the junior high school, to 70.6% in 1958, when the second and third classes were still there, to 76.5% in 1959 when only the third class was still in the school. When the first questionnaire was given, the program was in operation for less than a year and many parents were probably still not fully cognizant of the project's efforts and effects. From the parents' view the project had an increasing impact on the students over the three years, and there was a growth of parent awareness of what the project was doing and what was happening to their children in school.

What were the specific ways in which the parents thought the project had helped? The questionnaire asked the parents to evaluate the effectiveness for their children of several aspects of the program. For example, they were asked to indicate if the project had encouraged plans to graduate from high school, raised ambitions, improved study habits, and developed new interests in music and theatre. In 1957, when the project had been in effect for less than a year, only one of thirteen items listed was checked by a majority of parents. By 1958, eight of fifteen items listed and by 1959 twelve of these fifteen were checked by majorities of the parents. To the parents, the most valuable aspect of the program was the career information. This was the only item checked by a majority in the first year, and by the third year 90 per cent of the parents checked it. By the second and third years, majorities, generally larger in the third year, thought that the project had also succeeded in helping their children in educational planning, raising their sights, improving their school work, and giving them the opportunity to discuss their problems with the counselor. In the third year the majority of parents also noted increased interest in reading at home and half of the parents said their children had developed new interests in music, art, and theatre.

---

[4] Results of the 1957 and 1958 questionnaires were summarized in Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 24, May 1959.

3. Teacher Evaluation

To obtain an appraisal by teachers at the end of the three years of the program in Junior High School 43, a questionnaire was submitted in June 1959 to those faculty members who had been teaching in the school during the project years and for at least one year before the introduction of the project. A total of 39 teachers, 89 per cent of the 44 faculty members to whom the questionnaire was distributed, responded; 33 of these checked that they had taught experimental class students, 6 indicated they had not. The replies were anonymous.[5]

Although there was no unanimity of opinion on any single item, the responding teachers generally endorsed the project. The majority agreed that the project had shown gains over previous years in its major goals and that most of its procedures had been effective and worthwhile.

Effects on Students: Varying majorities of these teachers noted that it had succeeded with the experimental students to a greater degree than had the earlier regular school program with previous students.

The greatest number of teachers (92%) noted the success of the project in developing new interests in music, art, or theatre. Particularly large majorities indicated that it had succeeded in the major goals of expanding cultural horizons, encouraging interest in high educational goals, enhancing self-esteem and raising ambitions, improving achievement, and providing opportunities for counseling.

Effects on Parents: Percentages ranging from 69 per cent to 85 per cent of the responding teachers, thought that the project had not only raised the students' sights but had also raised the parents' goals for their children and increased parent interest and cooperation as well as understanding of the school program and of educational and career opportunities.

---

[5] The findings were reported in the Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 34, March 1960. (Mimeographed)

Suggestions: There were a wide variety of comments and suggestions, none given by a majority. The greatest agreement was on the need for continuing and expanding the program but suggestions about the direction that such expansion should take differed. Some mentioned the desirability of continuing or expanding certain services, with remedial and guidance services, cultural enrichment, split-half classes, and after-school study periods the most frequently mentioned. Some recommended that the non-experimental students should be included in such a program and some that certain aspects of the program should be extended to the elementary schools. The program has subsequently been extended to the elementary school level and to the students of all abilities in the Higher Horizons Program which is now operating in selected elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.

B. George Washington High School

Questionnaires were used in the high school to elicit student, parent, and staff evaluations of the project. Some of the items were the same as those on the questionnaire administered in the junior high school.

1. Student Opinions

Students in each of the three classes were polled again toward the end of their first and third years at George Washington High School.[6] When they responded to these questionnaires each of the classes had been in the high school for the same length of time but had been in the program in the junior high school for different periods.

Checklist Replies in Tenth Grade: A total of 335 students in the three project classes, 96 per cent of the project students registered in the classes at the time, replied to the questionnaire "About Me and My Plans: H. S. Edition" at the end of their first year in George Washington High School. The total time in the project in the junior and senior high schools was nearly two years for the first class, nearly three years for the second, and nearly four years for the third class.

The most widely acclaimed benefits concerned the counseling, information on careers and opportunities for new experiences, with the percentages checking these items ranging from 72 per cent to 79 per cent of the total group of 335 students, and from 80 per cent to 95 per cent of the 101 students in the third class.

---

[6] The results were reported in Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 48. (Mimeographed)

The earlier replies in ninth grade in junior high school of 115 students from the third class who were slated for admission to the high school project were compared with the replies of the 101 students in this project class at the end of tenth grade. On all but three of the fifteen items which were on both questionnaires the percentages were very similar in ninth and tenth grades.

On the three items which showed differences greater than ten per cent, a majority of the students thought they had been helped at both grade levels but there was increased appreciation in tenth grade of having the opportunity to talk things over with the counselor, and a smaller percentage in tenth grade than in the ninth grade who thought they had been helped in self-appraisal.

Checklist Replies in Twelfth Grade: A total of 222 students, 84 per cent of the 265 students still in the project in the twelfth grade, replied to the questionnaire "Student Evaluation of the Demonstration Guidance Project." At this time the students had all been in the high school project for nearly three years but in the junior high school program for differing periods, so that the total time in the project in both schools was nearly four years for the first class, nearly five years for the second class, and nearly six years for the third class.

According to the reports of these students who were still in school in the twelfth grade, the project had succeeded on every one of forty-one listed items in helping some students. These items included twenty-five items from the previous questionnaire. The additional items were mainly about specific preparation for entrance to higher education or employment. For the total group the percentage of students stating they had benefited on specific items ranged from 96 per cent who said they had been helped by having the chance to talk things over with the counselor and by receiving information about colleges and schools, which were major goals of the project, down to 18 per cent who had been helped to get along better with their families.

The most widespread benefits, according to these twelfth grade students, were counseling opportunities, college and career information, and help in planning further education. The percentages of students reporting being helped by these major guidance efforts ranged from 87 per cent to 96 per cent for the total group and from 90 per cent to 100 per cent for the third class.

The strong need that these students had for help with their personal problems and the importance of providing such help is shown by the fact that nearly half of the 222 students (and more than half of those in the third class) indicated that they had been helped by this special service which might be expected to apply to a limited number of students.

There are some variations between classes but most differences were too small to be significant. There was significantly increasing appreciation of the double period in English in the successive classes (46% in the first, 69% in the second, and 83% in the third.)

The questionnaire in twelfth grade included a question about the students' attitude toward extending the project to other schools. The students' overwhelming endorsement of the project was evident from the fact that 91 per cent of them favored such extension. There was strong agreement in all classes, with the highest proportion in the third class.

Students' Comments in Twelfth Grade: In the students' free comments on the questionnaire, the counseling, cultural program, small classes, individual help, educational encouragement and guidance were mentioned most frequently as having been of greatest benefit. However, what was most outstanding was that different students had gained most in different ways. To one student help in college admission, to another improvement in school work and to still another the chance to go to concerts might be the most deeply felt benefit.

A few students mentioned their feelings about some of the publicity which referred to them as underprivileged and slum children. They considered such terminology demeaning.

Comparison of Twelfth Grade With Group in Tenth Grade: The 222 students who remained in high school for three years were, for the most part, the more successful students. They indicated that they had benefited more on some of the key aims of the project than the total group of 335 students had indicated in tenth grade.

By the twelfth grade some of the guidance efforts and cultural gains were appreciated to an even greater extent than in tenth grade. The chance to talk things over with the counselor, information on careers, group guidance, the development of new cultural interests, and special help with personal problems had been valuable to proportionately more students in twelfth grade than in tenth grade (ranging from 12 to 17 percentage points higher in twelfth grade).

2. Parent Opinions

To find out what the parents of the project students at George Washington High School thought of the project, questionnaires were distributed in tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades. The parents of the third class, which had been in the program throughout the six junior and senior high school years, had replied in each of these grades. Their replies were the basic data and were compared with those of the second class in tenth grade and the first class in eleventh and twelfth grades.[7]

Regardless of class or grade differences, the overwhelming proportion of responding parents indicated that their children had been helped by the project. In the tenth grade when most of the students were still in school and the largest proportion of their parents replied, all but four of the 100 parents responding in the third class (96%) noted that their children had been helped in some of the ways listed on the questionnaire and eleven parents (11%) checked all fifteen items as successful. By eleventh grade every responding parent checked some item as having been helpful. In twelfth grade nearly all of the responding parents of those students who were still in the program favored extending the project to other schools. A total of 91 per cent of the parents in the first class and 96 per cent in the third class voted for this. There were no negative votes; the remaining small percentage did not reply to this question. These proportions were nearly identical with those of the students.

3. High School Staff Evaluation

A questionnaire to elicit the George Washington High School staff's evaluation was submitted to all those teachers in the school in March 1962 who had worked with project students at any time during the five years the project was in the high school. One hundred and ten staff members received the questionnaire. Eighty-two questionnaires were returned; sixty-two were filled out and twenty were returned blank by teachers who said they did not feel they had had sufficient experience with the project to evaluate it.[8]

While the replies were anonymous, the teachers had been asked to indicate the type and extent of their contacts with the students so that their responses could be interpreted. Their replies showed that the sixty-two who gave any opinions varied in the type, amount and recency of their experience with the project.

---

[7] The two questionnaires used were "George Washington High School Parent Questionnaire" in tenth and eleventh grades, "Parent Opinions About the Demonstration Guidance Project" in twelfth grade. The results were reported in Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 49. (Mimeographed)

[8] The results were reported in Demonstration Guidance Project Research Report No. 47. (Mimeographed)

The majority of the sixty-two respondents felt able to evaluate most items concerned with the effects of the program on the students, although the numbers varied for different items, but did not think they had had sufficient contact with parents to judge the items concerning the influence of the project on the parents.

Most of those teachers who did give evaluative judgments indicated that the outcomes had been positive for each of the listed items. The percentages who replied negatively were 5 per cent or less on all but two items; 8 per cent replied negatively on "improved reading comprehension" and 15 per cent on "improved behavior." The remaining teachers replied "don't know" or did not reply; these percentages ranged from 16 per cent to 57 per cent.

Effects on Students: A majority of sixty-two respondents thought that the project students were "generally better or improved to a greater degree during their three years in high school than similar students in previous classes or currently in regular classes." They thought that there had been gains in aspirations, achievement, attitudes and behavior; particularly in the desire to graduate from high school and interest in education beyond high school, in scholastic competence and attitude to learning, and also in self-esteem, ambitions, and behavior.

The fourteen teachers who had had the students for the double period in English had a greater opportunity to observe and know them, to judge their reading competence, and to know about their reading and cultural interests. Hence, a much larger majority of these teachers than of the total group responded on all items. Their evaluation was highly favorable on all items.

Effects on Parents: As indicated above, only a minority of teachers felt competent to evaluate the items on parents. Most of those who did express a judgment thought that the project had shown gains in parent interest and cooperation, in their understanding of educational and career opportunities, and in their higher goals for their children.

Values of Procedures: Concerning the project procedures or services, the large majority of teachers (ranging from 71% to 80% of the 62 teachers) indicated that having counselors available to discuss student problems with the teachers, being able to refer students for counseling, knowing about the students' potential and so having higher educational goals for them, and receiving information about the students' background had been valuable. Approximately half the teachers though the cultural program had helped in their work with students in subject matter classes.

Most of the teachers who indicated they had had enough contact with the group guidance to evaluate it thought it had been helpful. All of the teachers who could evaluate the special project instructional provisions of the double period in English and the small classes in mathematics and language indicated these had been valuable.

Comments: In the teachers' highly individual comments some common themes stood out. The value of small classes, including the especially small mathematics and language classes was mentioned most frequently. The benefits noted included particularly the chance for knowing the students better, and the consequent improved class atmosphere, participation and learning. The double period in English, the guidance and cultural programs also came in mainly for praise.

The large majority of teachers indicated on the checklist that the students' self-esteem had been enhanced and twelve teachers had comments on the increase in the students' poise and sense of self-worth. On the other hand, a few wrote that the students felt demeaned and humiliated by being referred to as "slum children" or "culturally deprived."

PART IV

SUMMARY

CHAPTER XI

THE PROJECT IN BRIEF

I. OVERVIEW

Purposes and Goals of the Project

The Demonstration Guidance Project was the realization of a recommendation by a subcommission of the Commission on Integration which was appointed by the Board of Education of the City of New York in 1953. The project, which was conducted in Junior High School 43, Manhattan and George Washington High School, was designed to demonstrate what could be done to identify able students from socially and economically disadvantaged urban areas and to stimulate them to seek higher educational and vocational goals. The special program was characterized by expanded, dynamic guidance and counseling services, special instructional and remedial help, broad cultural experiences, new approaches to parent education, financial or job aid, and clinical services. The research and evaluation purposes of the project were as follows:

1. To identify potentially academically able youth through the use of every possible device available, recognizing that the usual tests of academic aptitude and achievement may not predict the potential ability of these children.
2. To make studies of the "culture-fair" tests for prediction of academic aptitude.
3. To determine whether the program resulted in changes of the scholastic aptitude of project students.
4. To determine the effects of the program on the academic achievement of the project students.
5. To examine the educational and vocational goals and achievement of project students in relation to comparison groups of students who did not receive the program.
6. To assess the aspirations of project students and their parents as influenced by the program.
7. To appraise the social adaptability of the project students.
8. To make studies of the project by use of judgments by students, parents, and teachers.

The main financial support for the project was provided by the Board of Education, with additional help from the College Entrance Examination Board and the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students. The study was conducted by the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance and the Bureau of Educational Research with the latter bureau carrying major responsibility for identification, measurement, and evaluation. The direction and implementation of the program in the two schools was the responsibility of the respective principals and guidance coordinators.

The Schools in Which the Project Operated

Duration of the Project

In December 1956, project classes for grades 7, 8, and 9 were set up in Junior High School 43, Manhattan. As each project class completed grade 9, some of the students were selected to continue in the experimental classes in George Washington High School. The first project group was grade 9 in school year 1956-1957; they graduated from senior high school in 1960, after a total of four years in the project. The second project group was grade 8 and graduated from senior high school in 1961, after five years in the project. The third project group was grade 7 and graduated from senior high school in 1962, after six years in the project.

Junior High School 43, Manhattan

The junior high school district extends from Riverside Drive to St. Nicholas Terrace and from 116 Street to 145 Street, an area containing Manhattan's Morningside Heights and a small portion of West Harlem. The school met the criteria set up by the Advisory Committee of the project. One of these was that the school be accessible to an academic high school in which the project could be continued. In addition, the school was to have a coeducational student population of low socioeconomic status and a mixed ethnic character. Junior High School 43 had such a student population of approximately 1400. In 1956, at the time of the project's inception, approximately 48 per cent of the students were Negro, 40 per cent Puerto Rican, and 12 per cent Others. There were 717 students in the project group, 53 per cent Negro, 29 per cent Puerto Rican, 3 per cent Hispanic, and 16 per cent White. Many of the children came from broken homes in which there was no father and the mother worked. Others came from motherless homes and lived with the father, grandmother, or other relative. For those children who were new arrivals from Puerto Rico or the southern states there were special problems. The Spanish-speaking students needed to learn English and all had to orient themselves to a new high-pressure urban society and to different cultural values. Although data on fathers' or guardians' occupations were missing for a considerable percentage of the students, there was a clear concentration in the lower occupational categories and a very limited representation in the professional and managerial classifications. Generally, the group did not have deep roots in the city. Only half of the students and less than 10 per cent of the parents were born in New York City.

George Washington High School

George Washington High School is located in Washington Heights on the upper west side of Manhattan. As of 1956, the school had 5,000 students. Approximately 25 per cent were Negro, 10 per cent Puerto Rican, and 65 per cent Others. The 365 project students in the senior high school were made up of the more academically able student from the Junior High School 43 project classes. They were 54 per cent Negro, 26 per cent Puerto Rican, and 20 per cent Others.

Additional Staff Allotments and Costs for the Project

Junior High School 43

Already in the school, prior to the project, were two remedial reading teachers, an attendance and behavior counselor, Puerto Rican coordinator, speech improvement teacher, and Youth Board social worker. There was an afternoon and an evening community center. In order to carry out the project three full-time counselors, one for each of the three project groups, were added to the staff. Each counselor moved along with his group. The regular school counselor became the project coordinator. The project was also given the part-time services of a psychiatrist, a psychologist, and a social worker. In addition, two teachers were assigned part-time to remedial arithmetic, one to foreign language remedial service and one to educational and cultural enrichment. To these were added clerical assistants and research consultants. The average per capita cost was approximately $80 per year above the regular allotment for the students in conventional classes of average junior high schools in New York City.

George Washington High School

The per-pupil staff and financial allotments were higher for the senior high school project than for the junior high school project. This was due, in part, to the reduced number of project students in the senior high school project. There was one additional classroom teacher for every 30 students, compared to one extra position per 160 pupils in the junior high school. Each of the three project classes kept its own guidance counselor even though the senior high school project classes were half the size they had been in junior high school. A psychologist and a social worker were assigned to the senior high school project for one day a week each for the first year, and two days a week for the second and third years. The cost was approximately $250 per student per year above the usual allocation for an average senior high school student.

II. THE PROJECT IN OPERATION

Identification of Students with Academic Potential

The project staff decided to use a variety of instruments and observations to select students who might benefit from the project program. Every student who showed a glimmer of hidden aptitude was to be included in the program, regardless of an unfavorable prognosis on conventional tests.

Junior High School 43

The following devices were used in the selection of project students: (1) Verbal IQ from the Pintner Intermediate Test of Mental Ability, Verbal Series, the citywide test given in the eighth grade, (2) SRA Non-Verbal IQ, (3) three reading test scores, one from a citywide test and two from special administrations of the Stanford Achievement Reading Test, (4) three arithmetic test scores, from tests given at the same time as the reading tests, (5) teacher ratings of potential.

Selection of the project students was accomplished by November 1956. Since it was considered inadvisable to delay a year for further preparation and planning, classes were reorganized in December. It was hoped that the positive contributions of the project would outweigh any negative effects of the reorganization of classes in mid-year.

George Washington High School

There were two screenings of the junior high school project students to select those who would most likely be able to maintain themselves in an academic course in senior high school. The first screening took place as each class reached the end of ninth grade. Evaluation was made on the basis of test data, class marks, and teacher estimates. Since all junior high school students were free to apply to other senior high schools, not all of the students who passed this screening sought admission to George Washington High School. The 58 per cent who did apply were further evaluated for inclusion in the senior high school project classes. The following were the criteria for this final screening: (1) junior high school grade average at least 65, (2) Pintner IQ at least 90, (3) SRA Non-Verbal IQ

100 or above, (4) Paragraph Meaning grade equivalent at least 7.0, (5) Arithmetic Reasoning grade equivalent at least 6.5. Students who did not have minimum acceptable scores in one or two of the criteria but had other compensating qualities were included in the project group.

The number of students involved in various aspects of the project during the years 1956 to 1962 is presented below.

717 students, 52 per cent of the total junior high school body, were placed in project classes at the junior high school level.

582 students passed the initial screening for admission to the senior high school project classes.

378 students were finally accepted for admission to the George Washington High School project classes following the second evaluation. Of this number, 365 actually entered the classes.

307 students remained in the project classes to the end of grade 12.

The Junior High School Project Program

Guidance

The three special counselors assigned to the project and the project coordinator carried out guidance activities. The counselors taught the weekly group guidance classes in which they led discussions about careers and gave factual information regarding the various senior high schools in the city and the courses they offered their students. Films on various guidance topics were shown to the classes. The group guidance period was also used for the administration of questionnaires designed to help the counselors understand the students better, to aid educational and vocational planning, and to serve the research purposes of the project.

Each student had at least one scheduled interview per year with his counselor, but about half the students had from two to twenty interviews. There were also many brief contacts of less than ten minutes duration which served a variety of purposes. In addition, the counselors held regularly scheduled conferences with the homeroom teacher of each experimental class.

Assemblies and trips proved to be important adjuncts to the guidance program. Approximately one assembly a month was devoted to some aspect of guidance, featuring speakers from colleges, nursing schools, and industrial concerns, as well as former graduates from Junior High School 43.

Students were taken on trips to hospitals, industrial concerns, senior high schools, colleges, universities, and research centers.

Clinical Services

During the first year of the project, 1956-1957, the psychologist and the social worker functioned together one and one-half days per week as a clinic team for the project. In September 1957 clinical services for the junior high school were reduced to one day per week since the first project class was by that time in senior high school.

Special Instructional Program

The project students were grouped according to reading level and academic achievement so that classes would be as homogeneous as possible. There was no reduction in the registers of the experimental classes and each class followed the usual course of study. There was, however, a general enrichment of many aspects of the basic program. For example, students who were studying about New York State travelled by bus to Hyde Park to visit the home of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the science classes visited the Sloan-Kettering Medical Research Center and the Atomic Energy Center at Brookhaven. Films based on great literary classics were shown in school and students were encouraged to attend similar types of films at neighborhood theatres. Arrangements were made so that students could buy books at a discount for their personal reading pleasure.

Remedial Services

Assistance was given to the 329 students who were retarded 1.3 years or more in reading and the 341 students who were similarly retarded in arithmetic. During the first year, the two teachers assigned to do remedial work in each area met four times weekly with groups of six children each. During the second year a system of split half classes was set up by which one homeroom class was divided between two teachers, the upper 60 per cent receiving the course of study plus enrichment, and the lower 40 per cent receiving the course of study with emphasis on the necessary remedial aspects. Both group and individual remedial instruction were continued where necessary. Remedial classes were also provided for foreign languages. After-school facilities, manned by teachers with student assistants, were set up in a further attempt to extend remedial services and also to provide a place for doing homework for those without suitable accommodations at home.

Cultural Enrichment Program

The majority of the project students had little opportunity to participate in many of the cultural activities which are an integral part of the everyday experiences of children in more favored communities.

The program was, therefore, designed to help these children learn to enjoy good music, films, plays, and fine art. For all theatre and concert experience a preparation lesson presenting pertinent background information was drawn up and distributed to the appropriate teachers for adaptation to suit the specific needs of each class. The teachers also conducted follow-up discussions with the students involved.

Reaching and Influencing Parents

Parent cooperation is essential in motivating students to see higher education. For this reason, every attempt was made to reach the parents of project students. Parents' meetings were set up for both afternoon and evening so that parents who worked or needed to make arrangements for small children could attend. In addition, there was a series of workshops devoted to possible careers for project students. The counselors spoke privately with almost all of project parents at least once. Many of these parents had to make considerable sacrifices to come to school for the interview.

The Project Program in George Washington High School

Guidance

The senior high school project classes were much smaller than they had been in the junior high school and so the counseling services could be much more comprehensive. There was more time for consultation with the teachers and review of pertinent information about project students. Interviews were concerned with the students' programs, educational progress, health problems, emotional needs, post-high school plans, financial worries, difficulties at home, and boy-girl relationships. While the majority of the problems handled by the counseling office were the usual ones presented by most adolescents, others were more serious and required immediate emergency action as well as long-range planning.

Group guidance classes were similar in function to the classes in junior high school. There was much attention given to future work and college plans. Panel discussions, role playing, and films were used in these classes. Classes were also used for instruction and practice in filling out applications for college admission, scholarship aid, and College Entrance Examination Board Tests. In addition, there were trips to educational and scientific institutions.

Clinical Services

Students who required intensive counseling because of the complexity and severity of their problems were referred to the psychologist and social worker who were assigned to the school as a team one day a week during the first senior high school project year and two days a week during the remaining two years. Periodically, the counselors and clinical team reviewed the attendance, academic performance, and behavior of all project students to determine if clinical service might be needed. Help on an emergency basis was available at all times. Many of the cases involving severe personality disturbances were referred to hospitals and clinics.

Special Instructional and Remedial Program

Students were grouped homogeneously in all major subject areas on the basis of test data and school records. The registers of all project classes were well below average, with approximately 25 students in English, science, and social studies and 10 to 16 students in language and mathematics. Because the students needed intensive training in the basic skills of reading and writing, they were programmed in English for a double period daily. Students needing additional help were tutored after school in small groups of three or four, and occasionally, individually.

Cultural Enrichment Program

A program of cultural activities similar to that of the junior high school was arranged for the George Washington project students. There were visits to museums, libraries, colleges, and industrial plants. Arrangements were made for attendance at films, concerts, ballet, and theatre. Participation was voluntary. As with the junior high school program, there was time devoted to orientation and follow-up for each of these activities.

Reaching and Influencing Parents

This aspect of the George Washington project program was similar to the effort made to reach and influence parents in the junior high school.

III. FINDINGS

Measurement of Academic Achievement, Scholastic Aptitude and Attitudes of the Project Students

Changes in Academic Achievement

The data available show that the special instructional program resulted in positive gains by project students in the area of academic achievement. The greatest improvement was noted in reading. Reading had been given the most attention by project personnel when they set up the regular and remedial instructional programs. In arithmetic the gains were considered adequate in terms of the normal expectancy for the group. The scholastic averages of the project students were considered very favorable, particularly when they were compared by the teaching staff with the scholastic averages of similar pupils in classes prior to the start of the project.

Changes in Scholastic Aptitude

The following tests were given at various stages of the project to portions of the project group in order to measure changes in scholastic aptitude (or intelligence): Otis Mental Ability Test; Pintner General Ability Test, Verbal Series - Intermediate Test, Forms A and B, Advanced Test Forms A and B. There are theoretical differences among psychologists as to whether or not chronological age 15 should be the highest used in computing the ratio IQ. This is because increases in raw score lessen starting at chronological age 15 and almost cease at chronological age 17. When a ceiling chronological age of 15 was used in computation, appreciable gains in IQ were discovered for the project students. When 16 or 17 was used as denominator no appreciable gains were noted.

Attitudes of Project Students

In some classes the senior high school George Washington project students were grouped with non-project students of matched academic potential who had not come from project classes in Junior High School 43. A sociometric rating scale, "Picking Friends," based on the Ohio Acceptance Scale, was given to both project and non-project students in these mixed classes in order to determine the extent to which project students accepted each other and were accepted by their non-project classmates. The results indicated that there was positive peer acceptance in the project and non-project populations. The responses indicated that the project students had established good social relationships with their classmates and therefore it may be presumed that they felt personally secure in their surroundings. It was found that there existed a significantly greater degree of in-group acceptance among the experimental students than among the non-experimental students which was probably brought about by a longer period of social contact among project students.

Educational and Vocational Aspirations and Plans

A questionnaire, "About Me and My Plans," was administered to all students at Junior High School 43 in January 1957 and to all project students when they were in grades ten and twelve. As indicated by this questionnaire, the expressed educational and vocational aspirations of the project students were very high. They equalled, and in several categories surpassed the aspirations of a national sample of high ability students. These results are particularly important in view of the stress placed by the Commission on Integration on the need for raising the educational and vocational sights of able students from disadvantaged areas. In the early stages of the project the school personnel succeeded in stimulating educational and vocational dreams of students. The challenge presented to project personnel was to develop means by which these dreams could be translated into strongly motivated and realistic goals.

Final Educational Status of Project Students

The data are complete as of February 1963 and cover the 329 project students who remained in George Washington High School. (Twenty-two of these were transferred to non-experimental classes.) Of this group 21.3 per cent left school without graduating and 51 per cent entered some type of school beyond high school. The largest single number of students, 76, or 23.1 per cent of the 329 students, went to four year colleges. There were 60, or 21.2 per cent who went to two year colleges and 25, or 6.6 per cent who entered special schools such as business, beauty culture, and hospital nursing schools, and mechanical institutes. Fairly similar percentages of boys and girls entered two or four year colleges.

Data are also available for 210 of the 265 students who had been rated experimental by the junior high school but did not enter senior high school project classes. Of these 210 students, 38 entered the special academic high schools, and 172 were judged by George Washington High School as not having sufficient academic potential to enter the senior high school project classes. From this latter group, 10.4 per cent entered four year colleges and 7.6 per cent entered two year colleges. An additional 5.2 per cent entered special schools.

One of the methods by which the effectiveness of the project was to be judged was through a comparison of the final educational status of the entire student body of the junior high school (both project and non-project groups) during the project years with the total junior high school graduating classes for the three years immediately preceding the project. It was felt that these latter classes would provide the most valid comparison group to meet the evaluation purposes of the research staff. During the project years a new housing development brought some additional children from middle income families into the area. Also, the junior colleges were expanded and there was a growing climate of popular support for higher education. Nonetheless, after a study of other possible comparison groups for the 1957-59 junior high school graduating classes, the research staff concluded that the 1954-56 graduating classes were the most suitable for comparison. The data showed that there was a significant increase in the percentage of students graduating during project years who entered four year colleges and other post-high school institutions. Although the factors mentioned above may account partly for the increase, it is reasonable to conclude that the project program played a significant role.

Prediction of Academic Potential

One of the primary objectives of the project was to refine the methods and techniques for prediction of academic potential. Standardized test results are less reliable for students from low socio-economic backgrounds than they are for students from families of middle and upper socio-economic status. As has been mentioned earlier, it was decided to experiment with a variety of techniques in setting up criteria for the selection of both junior and senior high school project students. Decisions were made on the basis of the following: SRA Non-Verbal IQ, Stanford Paragraph Meaning grade equivalent, Stanford Arithmetic Reasoning grade equivalent, mid-term averages in grade 9, Pintner Intermediate IQ, average grade 8 teacher ratings, average grade 9 teacher ratings, and grade 9 counselor ratings. Students' ratings on each of these selection techniques were correlated with academic success which was measured by tenth grade final marks in major subjects, graduation class rank, and post-high school educational status.

In general, the students who received academic diplomas and went on to liberal arts colleges scored higher on each of the initial selection criteria than did students who did not complete high school. However, because of the overlap found for each of the criteria, it cannot be concluded that performance on any one of the selection criteria could be used solely to predict final educational status. There was some improvement in prediction when the selection criteria were employed to forecast class standing upon graduation from high school. Teacher ratings were superior to the other selection criteria, but not enough to warrant use as the sole predictor.

It is clear that some of the many factors involved in achieving academic success were not detected by the measuring devices employed. In order to select students having college potential from among a group of students who are culturally and economically similar to the project students, it is desirable to exclude only those who score relatively low in all or almost all of the criteria.

Student, Parent, and Staff Appraisal of the Project

Surveys made several times during the six project years yielded abundant evidence relating to evaluation of various aspects of the project by the students, their parents, and their teachers. In general, the students viewed the project with approval and testified about the help it had given them. In their testimony they gave high priority to the counseling services, information on careers, and opportunities for new experiences. Almost all of the parents and teachers who responded to the questionnaires felt that the project had helped the students to achieve higher goals in academic aspirations and achievements and cultural experiences. The teachers stressed particularly gains in student motivation to graduate from high school and to continue their education beyond high school. They also noted improvement in scholastic competence, attitude toward learning, growth in self-esteem, higher level of aspiration, and socially acceptable behavior and conduct.

CONCOMITANTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROJECT

As the project progressed from year to year, from 1956 through 1962, the annual progress reports presented evidence that the major objectives were gradually being realized. The project stimulated not only the dedication and imagination of the staff of each school, but also the interests of educators and the public. It proved that many disadvantaged youth with potential college ability could aspire with success to higher education. Newspapers, magazines, radio and television media were eager to broadcast the story of the project.

This report has given the details behind the project - the expanded guidance services, academic remedial and tutorial services, cultural enrichment activities, clinical services, and involvement of parents - each of which cost additional money, as much as $250 per pupil in senior high school, above the city average. The report does not tell of the scholarships and other financial aids that permitted many able students from disadvantaged homes to continue their education in post-high school colleges and institutions of higher learning. The Demonstration Guidance Project has proved that its objectives can be realized if society - the public - is willing to pay the price for conservation of human resources.

One consequence of the Guidance Demonstration Project was the initiation of the Higher Horizons Program in the New York City Public Schools. The general objective of the Higher Horizons Program was to provide enriched educational and cultural experiences to disadvantaged children in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Officials from schools in many large cities in the United States visited, observed, and conferred about the Demonstration Guidance Project and Higher Horizons Program. Many were stimulated to initiate similar programs in their school systems. Thus the impact of the original experiment was evident not only in New York City but also in other large cities throughout the nation.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Demonstration Guidance Project

ABOUT ME AND MY PLANS

Name______________________________Age________School____________Class___________

Boy______Girl_____Address_______________________________Date___________________.

We are asking you these questions in order to learn how best to help you to make and carry out your educational plans and to choose a high school.

1. (Write 1 after the course you want as your first choice, and 2 after your second choice.) The course I would like to take in high school is:

   Academic________ Commercial________ General________ Vocational________

   The special vocational course I would like is: First choice__________________

   Second choice____________________________ Third choice________________________

2. (Check only one in the first column and one in the second column)

	I would like to	My parents (guardians) would like me to
a) graduate from high school and then go to college......	______	_______
b) graduate from high school and then go to business or technical school or some other school but not college.	______	_______
c) graduate from high school but not go on to college or other school after high school.	______	_______
d) leave school before finishing high school.	______	_______

3. I would need financial help in order to graduate from high school . . . .(Yes______) (No______)

4. I would need financial help in order to go to college or other school after high school. . . . .(Yes______) (No______)

5. For my life work, I would like to be ____________________________________.

6. My family wants me to be ____.

7. I work part-time now. (Yes ____) (No_____) Description of work______________

   ____.

8. My father is living. (Yes____) (No____).

9. My mother is living. (Yes____) (No____).

10. My father's (guardian's) occupation is ________________________________.

11. My mother (guardian) goes out to work. . . . . (Yes____) (No____)

Her occupation is ________________________________.

12. One or more of my relatives have graduated from high school.(Yes____) (No____)

If yes, who?________________________________.

13. One or more of my relatives went to college, or now go to college . . . .(Yes____) (No____)

If yes, who?________________________________.

14. The number of persons in my family is____. The number of older brothers I have is ____; older sisters ____; younger brothers____; younger sisters____.

15. The people who live with me are:(check)Mother___Father___Stepmother____ Stepfather______.

The number of any of the following persons who live with me is:
Guardians___Grandmothers___Grandfathers___Uncles___Aunts___
Stepbrothers____Brothers___Stepsisters___Sisters___Cousins____
Nephews___Nieces___Others________________________________.

16. (Check one of these) We live in: A rooming house___; A walk up apartment___; A self-service elevator apartment___; An apartment with an elevator operator___; A one family house___; A two family house____; Other (describe)________________________________.

(Also check only if they apply to you) A project apartment________
An apartment we share with another family_________

17. The number of rooms we have is ____. The number of persons in these rooms is____. I share my room with ________________________________.

APPENDIX B

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Demonstration Guidance Project
George Washington High School

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Student's Name______________________Boy___Girl___Class________Date____________

Your Name___________________________________Relationship to Student______________

Address____Telephone No._____________________

Please check the high school course that your child is taking.
Academic_____ Commercial_____ General______

1. Would you like your child to graduate from high school? Yes____No____Undecided_____

2. Will your child have to leave high school before graduation if he does not receive financial help? Yes____No____Maybe_________

3. Would you like your child to go to work as soon as he (she) finishes high school? Yes____No____Undecided_____

4. Would you like your child to continue his (her) education after high school? Yes____No____Undecided______
   If you would like your child to continue, what type of school would you like him (her) to go to?
   Four year college_____ Two year college______
   Other type of school (describe)_____________________Don't Know______

5. Will you need financial help to send your child to college or other school after high school? Yes____No____Maybe______

6. What would you like your child to be when he (she) grows up? ____

7. What does he or she want to be?____

8. Have you changed any of your plans for your child because of the guidance project? Yes____No____
   If you have, please tell what changes:

9. Has the guidance project helped your child? Yes____ No____ Don't Know_____

If it has helped, check as many of these as tell what the project did for your child?

(1) improved school work . . . . __________
(2) raised ambitions . . . . __________
(3) improved study habits. . . . . __________
(4) gave information on careers. . . . . __________
(5) helped in getting along better . . . . __________

(6) gave chance to talk things over with counselor . . . . __________
(7) increased interest in reading at home . . . . __________
(8) encourgged plans to graduate from high school . . . . __________
(9) encouraged thinking about going to college . . . . __________
(10) developed new interests in music, art, or theater. . . . . . __________

(11) gave information about types of colleges and other schools . __________
(12) helped in planning high school course. . . . . __________
(13) helped speak better. . . . . __________
(14) increased interest in school . . . . __________
(15) encouraged listening to better radio programs, and seeing better movies and TV shows. . . . . __________

If there are other ways in which it helped your boy or girl, please tell how.

10. If there is any way that you think the school could be of more help to your boy or girl, or you, please tell how.______________________________

11. Have you had a chance to see your child's counselor this year? Yes____ No_____

12. If the same counseling service is available next year would you like to see your child's guidance counselor in the fall? Yes____ No_____

APPENDIX C

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Demonstration Guidance Project
Junior High School 43, Manhattan

HIGH SCHOOL FOLLOW-UP FORM

Date__________________________

Class__________________________

Name______________________ Birthdate______________________ B G N P W O

Last Known Address____

High School__________________________ Term Entered_________ Date Entered_________

1. Eighth Grade Test Data: Pintner I.Q._____ Stan. Read._____ Stan.Arith.______

2. Total Number of Terms in High School____ Number of Terms of Major Subjects: Passed____________ Failed__________

3. Terms of Work in Courses Acceptable for College Admission

	No. Passed	No. Failed
a. English		
b. Mathematics		
c. Soc. Studies		
d. Science		
e. Language		
f. Other(s) (Specify)		

4. High School Course Chosen: Acad.___ Comm.___ Gen.___ Voc.___ Other__________ (Specify)

5. High School Course at Admission: Acad.___ Comm.___ Gen.___ Voc.___ Other__________ (Specify)

6. TRANSFERRED: Date____________________ Term________ To______________________

Course at Time of Transfer: Acad.___Comm.___Gen.___Voc.___Other____________ (Specify)

7. DISCHARGED: Date______________ Reason: E.C.____17/ Yrs.____Other______________ (Specify)

Course at Time of Discharge: Acad.___Comm.___Gen.___Voc.___Other____________ (Specify)

8. GRADUATED: Date______________Course:Acad.___Comm.___Gen.___Voc.___Other_______ (Specify)

9. Grade Average______________Rank in Class______________

10. College Applications Forwarded to: ____

____

____

IF INFORMATION ON ANY ITEM IS NOT KNOWN, PLEASE SPECIFY THE ITEM OR ITEM NUMBER:

____

Please return this completed form to: J. Wayne Wrightstone, Director
Bureau of Educational Research
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn 1, New York

APPENDIX D

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Demonstration Guidance Project
Junior High School 43, Manhattan

POST-HIGH SCHOOL DATA FORM

1. NAME: ____
Last First Middle

2. ADDRESS: ____
City Zone State

3. SCHOOL OR COLLEGE: ____
Name of school or college now attending or last attended

4. DIVISION OR BRANCH: ____
Name of division or branch of school or college, if any

5. Check one: I am now attending_____ no longer attending_____ school or college.

6. Check whether Matriculated ( ) or Non-Matriculated ( ) if attending or when you attended.

7. Do you now, or did you attend full or part time? Check one: Full time ( )
Part time ( )

8. Check below the course you are now taking or were taking:

a. Liberal Arts ( )
b. Business ( )
c. Education ( )
d. Music ( )
e. Nursing ( )
f. Vocational ( )
g. Voc. Technical ( )
h. Applied Arts and Science ( )
i. ____________ ( )
(Other)

9. If you are now in school answer items "a" to "g":

a. Date of entering school or college? ______________________________

b. What are you majoring in? ______________________________

c. Name of the degree or certificate you expect to receive? ______________________________

d. What career will this prepare you for? ______________________________

e. Number of years you have been attending this school? ______________________________

f. Number of semester hours of credit earned? ______________________________

g. When will you complete your education? Give approximate date. ______________

10. If you are not now in school answer items "a" to "g":

a. Date of entering school or college?____________________

b. Date of leaving school:____________Was course completed? Yes____ No_____
Month Year

c. If course was completed, what is the name of the degree or certificate received?____________________

d. If course was not completed, give the reason for leaving school.__________

____

e. Number of semester hours of credit earned when you left school?__________

f. Do you intend to return to complete course? Yes___No___ If yes, when?_____

g. If you return to school how long do you think it will take to complete your education? Years________ Months__________

11. If you are now employed full or part time answer items "a" to "e":

a. State briefly the type of work you are now doing:____________________

____

b. How long have you had this job? Years________ Months_______

c. Do you like your work? Yes________ No___________

d. What are your plans for the future?____________________

____

e. List jobs you have had and length of time on each since leaving school or college.

(1) ______________________________How long on this job?___________

(2) ______________________________How long on this job?___________

(3) ______________________________How long on this job?___________